DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 235 124 SP 023 016

AUTHOR Dierenfield, Richard B.
TITLE Classroom Disruption in English Comprehensive Schools.
PUB DATE 82
NOTE 93p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Attitudes; Antisocial Behavior; *Behavior Problems; Classroom Techniques; Comparative Analysis; Corporal Punishment; *Discipline; Foreign Countries; Secondary Education; *Student Behavior; Student Teacher Ratio; Student Teacher Relationship; *Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Effectiveness; Teaching Methods
IDENTIFIERS *Great Britain; *United States

ABSTRACT

A comparative study was made of disruptive behavior in British comprehensive schools and American high schools. A survey was conducted in 41 British schools to obtain the opinions of teachers and administrators on severe discipline problems, causes of disruptive behavior, and possible solutions. There was general agreement that classroom disruption was viewed as a serious but not a critical matter by British school personnel. Major causes of disruptive behavior were considered to be both "unsettled home environment" and attitudes in society as a whole which foster anti-authoritarian behavior. High student-to-teacher ratio was also cited as a critical factor. There was substantial agreement that a good teacher is a crucial factor in classroom control. It was noted that the British "pastoral care programs," which stress social personal development of students under faculty guidance, were significantly effective in controlling disruptive behavior. It was further noted that the fact that British administrative personnel assume teaching duties, in addition to administrative work, had an impact on student behavior. Survey results are presented in tabular format. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED235124

CLASSROOM DISRUPTION IN ENGLISH COMPREHENSIVE SCHOOLS

Richard B. Dierenfield, Ed.D
Professor and Chairman
Department of Education
Macalester College

Macalester College
St. Paul, Minnesota
1982

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. B. Dierenfield

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☑ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

SP 023 016

Foreward

This study of classroom disruption in English comprehensive schools was begun during the Spring of 1981 as a Sabbatical leave project. Financial support came from the Mellon Fund for Faculty Research at Macalester College.

The purpose of the investigation centered on discovering the nature, causes and remedies for classroom disorder in English comprehensive schools. The hope I entertained was that new approaches and techniques might be uncovered which could be transferred to American public schools.

The kindness and cooperation I received from the personnel in many comprehensive schools has been greatly appreciated. Special thanks is extended to Professor and Mrs. Maurice Kogan, of Brunel University for their generosity and consideration to my wife and me.

The format of this report is not as polished as I would like it to be. Lack of time is the culprit but I am anxious to put out the substance of the survey despite its rather rough style.

I am hopeful that the following pages contain information and ideas which will be of help to both English and American school people. If some use of this material can be made in understanding and dealing with classroom discipline problems, the project will have been worthwhile.

St. Paul, Minnesota

Richard B. Dierenfield

Table of Contents

I. Introduction 1

II. Classroom Disruption: A Common Problem in American and English Secondary Schools 2

What is the Problem? 2

Extent of the Problem in American Public Schools 3

Extent of the Problem in English Comprehensive Schools 4

A Comparison Between American and English Comprehensive Secondary Schools 5

What Both Types of Schools Have In Common 6

How the Two Schools Differ 7

Transfer of Approaches and Methods From English to American Schools 8

III. Causes of Classroom Disruption in English Comprehensive Secondary Schools As Seen In the Literature 9

IV. Design of This Study 16

V. Teachers and Administrators View Classroom Disruption In Comprehensive Schools 18

Demographic Information 19

Table 1 "Location of Respondents"..... 20

Analysis 20

Table 2 "In what type of school are you employed?" 20

Analysis 21

Table 3 "What is your position in the school?" 21

Analysis 21

Table 4 "Sex of respondent" 22

Analysis 22

Table 5 "Subject matter area of respondents" 23

Analysis 23

Table 6 "What is the enrollment of your school?" 24

Analysis 24

Table 7 "How long have you been employed in secondary schools"

Table 7 "How long have you been employed in secondary schools?" 24

Analysis 25

Table 8 "In what sized community is your school located?" 25

Analysis 25

Table 9 "Extent of classroom disruption in comprehensive schools: 26

Analysis 27

Table 10 "Direction of classroom disruption" 27

Analysis 28

Table 11 "Types of troublesome pupil behavior" 29

Analysis 31

Table 12 "Causes of disruptive behavior" 32

Analysis 34

Table 13 (a) "Factors in controlling disruptive behavior"..... 35

Table 13 (b) " " " " " 36

Analysis 39

Table 14 "Five most important factors in maintaining classroom order 39

Table 15 "Suggestions to reduce classroom disruption"..... 40

Analysis 41

VI. Summary and Conclusions 42

Appendix 47

Tables I to XV 48

Cover Letters 80

Questionnaire 82

Bibliography 84

CLASSROOM DISRUPTION: IN ENGLISH COMPREHENSIVE SCHOOLS

I. Introduction

"Discipline in schools." The very mention of the term often strikes terror in the heart of a beginning teacher, can bring looks of concern to the faces of parents and is likely to cause furrowed brows in experienced school personnel. The problem of maintaining acceptable standards of pupil behavior in institutions of learning has vexed teachers since ancient times. No one needs to be told there is a problem; what is required is help in dealing with it. Many books have been written on the subject, symposia held, laws passed, advice given and containment schemes put into practice in schools. While success has marked some efforts the difficulty has not been eliminated, and perhaps it can only be reduced.

In considering the issue it may be helpful to examine what another school system does to reduce the impact of classroom disruption on its educational enterprise. Perspective on the American situation can be gained by studying how the English deal with the problem. Specific techniques and approaches may be learned which could be adapted to work in American secondary schools.

This is the focus of the following study. It is hoped that by showing the dimensions of the problem in English comprehensive schools, revealing the attitudes of teachers and administrators and offering their suggestions on helpful measures to cope with the difficulty, a new view of the situation can be achieved and assistance to their American counterparts may be received.

The paper will be divided into several sections as follows:

1. An examination of the matter of classroom disruption in American and English comprehensive schools, as well as a consideration of how and whether there can be a viable transfer of ideas and approaches between the two systems of schooling.

2. The causes of classroom disruption as seen by English teachers groups and other interested parties.

3. The treatment of the problem from the viewpoint of teaching strategies and institutional procedures.

4. A description of the research methods and design used in this survey study.

5. The information received from the response to the questionnaire survey.

6. The conclusions and interpretations which can be drawn from the results of the poll.

It is my great hope that some of the material and ideas presented here will be helpful to the American classroom teacher. After all the theorizing and pontificating has been done it is he/she who must face classes of adolescents and deal with the matter of disruption where it is reality.

II. Classroom Disruption: A Common Problem in American and English Secondary Schools

The English and American peoples have much in common; cultural heritage, language (some may disagree), and legal concepts spring to mind. We also share a problem; the learning hazzard termed "classroom disruption" in tax supported schools.

What Is the Problem?

It is possible to couch the issue in theoretical terms and cover it with verbiage until it is hardly recognizable. I really do not mean to denigrate the processes of philosophizing, theorizing and creating abstract concepts about the matter. They have their uses but this paper aims at being as practical and helpful to teachers and school administrators as possible.

Classroom disruption in all its ludicrous simplicity is acting in such a way within a educational group as to prevent or reduce the achievement of learning objectives. It is quite possible for teachers to be the offenders, but in this paper we are dealing with what pupils do to wreck a reasonable learning environment.

What constitutes this activity varies widely depending on the type of lesson involved, the personality and tolerance of both pupils and teacher, the age level and type of learning group as well as other factors. A pupil activity which constitutes "disruption" in one situation may be perfectly acceptable in another. In the final analysis, however, it must be the judgment of the class leader - the teacher - which should be taken as the ultimate decision on what is or is not disruptive. If this view is found to be totally unreasonable school authorities need to take appropriate action to remedy the situation.

Extent of the Problem In American Public Schools

It is difficult to assess in quantitative terms how much disruption takes place in American secondary school classrooms. Among the devices used to be specific about the problem are teachers feelings as revealed by polls, the numbers, kind and severity of assaults on pupils, and teachers, and reports by school administrators.

There is little doubt that classroom teachers put "discipline" at or near the top of any list of problems they face. In one of many surveys which could be cited on the subject, of 3500 teachers interviewed, 2835 gave discipline problems as their greatest concern.[1]

The American public also views the issue of maintaining order in school to be at or near the top of educational deficiencies. The Gallup Poll of 1980

---

1. From Donald C. Orlich, et.al., Teaching Strategies, D.C. Heath & Co. Lexington, Mass. 1980 p. 376

revealed that Americans feel lack of discipline to be the most serious problem facing public schools. This has held first place in 11 of the last 12 year polls that have been taken.[2] Almost twice as many named "lack of discipline" as the most important problem in public education (26%) as chose the second place problem, "use of dope/drugs" (14%)[3]

Extent of the Problem In English Comprehensive Schools

The difficulty in being specific about the extent of discipline problems exists when referring to English schools. We must depend on such indications as the amount of literature on the subject, assault figures etc. The results of the survey reported in this paper (on teachers and administrators attitudes) are the only ones I have discovered in reading the literature for the past 10 years on the subject.

A conservative teachers organization, The National Association of Schoolmasters and the Association of Women Teachers, have expressed concern about the extent of "indiscipline" and have published a booklet to help their members.[4]

Within the last 10 years the British Educational Index lists 36 books on school discipline as well as several dozen journal articles.

Assault and disruption figures available are not particularly enlightening in determining how widespread these problems are in English schools.

In a 1973 study made by the Association of Education Committees for the Department of Education and Science the following figures were disclosed:[5]

7.68 incidents of violence per 10,000 pupils in secondary schools

3.81 incidents of rowdyism per 10,000 pupils in secondary schools

---

2. The Gallup Opinion Index, "Crisis of Confidence in Public Schools Continues" p.3

3. Ibid p. 4

4. National Assn. of Schoolmasters and Association of Womens Teachers
L. C. Comber and R. C. Whitfield
Action on Indiscipline: A Practical Guide For Teachers, Birmingham, 1979,73 pages.

5. Jones-Davies, C. and R.C. Cave, The Disruptive Pupil In the Secondary School, Ward Lock Educational, London 1976, p.7

"Violence" and "rowdyism" were not defined nor was the length of time involved specified.

Another survey reported the state of affairs in English secondary schools as follows:[6]

0.64 incidents of violence per 100 pupils in secondary schools.

4.48 incidents of disruption per 100 pupils in secondary schools.

It is difficult to interpret these data because of the lack of definition of terms and the inability to compare the figures with a similar group in previous perids. I leave it to the reader to draw his/her own conclusions.

While hard data on the extent of disciplinary problems in English comprehensive schools seems unavailable it is obvious that the situation is viewed by many as a serious matter. Such indications as the large number of newspaper articles, letters to the editor, television programs, handbooks on school discipline, conferences for teachers, etc. point to a general concern over the issue.

American school teachers and administrators will find cold comfort in the realization that others have similar difficulties. It does, at least, tell us that we are not alone in facing substantial behavior problems.

A Comparison Between American and English Comprehensive Secondary Schools

The question may well be asked at this point, "what good will it do American school personnel to know about discipline strategies and problems in English comprehensive schools?" While most American elementary school teachers are aware of the inquiry and discovery methods commonly found in junior schools in England, the comprehensive school is not so widely known among junior and senior high teachers in the United States. The stereotype of an English elitist secondary education system remains all too prevelant in the minds of many. The fact is that today the great majority of English young people between the ages of 13 and 16 attend comprehensive school.

Before proceeding further we must clarity how American and English comprehensive secondary schools are alike and how they differ. In making this comparison

---

6. Ibid. p. 8

caution is required as not all schools of either national system are exactly the same. What is mentioned here refers to general characteristics, not to the particulars and details of each individual institution.

What Both Types of Schools Have In Common:

1. They are tax-supported and are maintained through the use of public money. Some English schools have combined control with private (mainly religious) groups and public education authorities joining in operating the institution.

2. They enroll generally similar numbers of students. English comprehensives fall between 500 and 1500 pupils with very few smaller and even fewer larger.[7]

3. Both types of schools offer a broad curriculum to their students with emphasis on general education through age 16. In English schools those who stay on after 16 specialize in two or three areas, i.e. science, mathematics, languages, etc.

4. Each institution enrolls a student body reflecting a broad spectrum of intellectual and socio-economic backgrounds. This varies, of course, with the type of nearby community whose children attend, but the theory is that both schools are open to all of the children of all the parents in the area.

5. The great majority of the schools in either system are coeducational. A few single sex comprehensive schools exist in English education authorities.[8] (N.B. - all the schools in the survey reported later in this paper are co-educational.)

6. School attendance is compulsory to age 16 in both systems. It should be noted that the English child begins formal schooling at age 5.

7. Both employ a platoon system where students change rooms for lessons.

8. Class size generally is between 20-30 except in English schools over age 16 they usually are smaller.

---

7. Department of Education and Science, List of 3222 Comprehensive Schools Typed list. London 1980, 66 pages.

8. Ibid.

How the Two Schools Differ

1. The English school operates a double approach to education - an academic one and a "pastoral" system stressing social and personal development of pupils. The pastoral care aspect is under staff administrators drawn from the academic faculty.

2. English comprehensives offer greater official possibilities of corporal punishment, especially "the cane". This is strictly regulated as to who administrators what to whom, where and when. Records are also kept of the punishment.

3. External examinations play a much greater role in determining the details of what is taught in English schools than in American. Pupils do not "graduate" from secondary school, they take "O Level" (ordinary) exams in 5-10 subject areas at age 15+ and many end their school careers then. A number never attempt the exams and simply drop at 16. Some go on and take "A Level" (advanced) exams at 18+. To service those taking exams much coursework centers on preparations for these tests.

4. It is almost universal that the head master/mistress and the deputy heads teach classes as well as act as the administrator of a comprehensive school.

5. A sizable percentage of any comprehensive school faculty has some administrative duty as well as teaching responsibility. Such activities as relate to the pastoral care system usually take a good deal of time and a reduction in teaching load is normally given to equalize the work.

6. The English system incorporates a "Board of Governors" as part of the organizational structure of each school. This body acts as an advisory group to the headmaster/mistress and staff regarding matters of policy and can serve as the representatives of the public in reflecting constituent opinion on a wide range of issues.

7. The headmaster/mistress of an English comprehensive secondary school holds a good deal more power in school operation than an American secondary school principal.

He/she is entrusted with much decision-making authority although most consult extensively with their staff on matters of importance. A great amount of care is taken before appointing a head and almost all the many heads I have known have been extremely able people. It is interesting to note that no special degree work or administrative training is required of heads as is true of American principals. Successful teaching experience is a universal prerequisite.

Transfer of Approaches and Methods From English To American Schools

The list of similarities and differences presented above is far from complete. Also the points listed are, of necessity, over simplified as anyone very familiar with either or both systems will recognize. Nevertheless I firmly believe that there is enough congruence between the two to warrant serious consideration of the use of ideas, methods, organization, etc. found in one by the other. The process must be one of adaption to varying conditions rather than wholesale adoption without careful analysis of the problem of fittness.

One example of this mutual interchange can be seen in the widespread interest in and incorporation by American elementary schools of the inquiry and discovery method of teaching developed in England. Another illustration is the introduction of the American concept of a comprehensive public secondary school providing education for all the children of all the parents who wish to use it. Thus ideas flow across the Atlantic from both east and west to the advantage of all.

Enough problems arise in presenting a viable education in public schools catering to a wide spectrum of pupils who are required by law to attend that those who are involved, should be open to suggestions from all quarters. It is with this situation in mind that I have made the study of classroom disruption in English comprehensive secondary schools.

Before presenting the design and results of the survey it will be helpful to examine how the English view the issue of school discipline. This process will allow the information I have gathered to be seen in better perspective.

III. Causes of Classroom Disruption In English Comprehensive Secondary Schools As Seen In the Literature

When anyone, from the youngest comprehensive school student to the most distinguished authority on the subject, is asked about the basic reasons for classroom discipline problems everyone has an answer and usually solutions. Since we all have been to school many individuals look upon themselves as experts through that experience. As so often is true of complex subjects, diverse viewpoints are likely to contain elements of truth. The analogy of the seven blind men feeling the elephant springs to mind. Simplified solutions offered by some are similar to one blind man declaring the elephant is like a tree trunk when he felt the leg. To appreciate the broad problem of classroom disruption we must view the whole animal not simply one aspect of the situation.

In order to present this broader picture we will first consult what has been written on the matter. The subject of causes for school discipline in English secondary schools does not lack exposition on the printed page. Writers dealing with it are, among others, such people as Her Majesty's Inspectors, Area Education Officers, headmasters/mistresses, school psychologists, social workers, teachers and pupils as well. In order to simplify reviewing their ideas on causation as found in the literature, a list of their views will now be presented. No ranking order of importance is suggested by where the item appears in the list. It is vital to remember that these reasons for class disruption have been gleamed by a careful reading of education books and journals. No conclusions can be drawn about how serious educators feel each cause may be. The results of the survey in Chapter V will show this aspect in considerable detail. The idea here is simply to enumerate causes for disruption as seen by people who have written on the subject.

The following reasons have been cited as contributing to discipline problems in the classroom:

1. Bleak post-school employment prospects which leads to apathy or frustration in youngsters faced with little liklehood of a job after they leave school.

2. An inappropriate curriculum for many average or below average pupils who receive essentially the old grammar school education which appears irrelevant to their needs and lives.

3. The examination system which often dominates school programs but for many has little meaning as they either fail or do not attempt even the new modified tests.

4. Classroom disruption is merely a reflection of the more violent, anti-authoritarian, permissive attitude common in modern society in general.

5. Lack of support for disciplinary measures used by the individual classroom teacher by the administrative hiarachy from deputy heads to headmasters/mistresses through and including the Local Education Authorities.

6. Lack of parental support for teachers in maintaining classroom decorum, with those parents having the most difficult children often providing little or no cooperation in the matter.

7. The neglect of a required cooperative approach among all members of the staff to treatment of disruption which often leads to uneven or inconsistent dealing with the problem.

8. Living in a world in which violence and revolt against authority is commonplace and can be magnified and often glorified by the media, particularly television.

9. The debilitating influence of a few poor teachers in nearly every school which encourages disruptors to more widespread activity.

10. Large classes which make it difficult for teachers to know and deal with each pupil as an individual.

11. Large schools which encourage the cloak of a anonymity to cover disruptions which in smaller schools would be dealt with on a more personal level.

12. Teacher education programs which do not stress preparation for handling disciplinary problems.

13. Teachers who are unsure of themselves, their material or methods and who engender in their pupils an uneasy attitude which may take the form of class disruption.

14. Mean, vicious or unsympathetic teachers who may force pupils into rebellion by their tactics.

15. Young, beginning teachers who often need help in discipline but are reluctant to seek it because of the professional shame of this action.

16. The nature of adolescents who are becoming young adults and seek more independence, resenting curbs from authority sometimes without reason.

17. The disruptive influence of one or two problem children can exert peer pressure on weaker personalities to follow their example.

18. Home situations, through worry about a multitude of possible problems or because of violence within the family group can cause disruptive reactions from children.

19. Pupils who have been labeled as problem students through being placed in "Sin Bins", suspended or otherwise disciplined, often feel they must live up to their reputation as trouble makers.

20. A high turn over of teaching staff through reductions caused by dropping enrollment, lowered budgets, or other reasons, creates lack of instructional continuity and faculty uneasiness both of which can affect pupil reaction to school discipline.

21. Poor, boring, disorganized teaching in which the pupil is confused, uninterested or doomed to failure, can cause even placid and normally cooperative children to disrupt classes.

While the reasons listed here do not cover every one mentioned in the literature they do include the major factors for classroom disruption. One thing

is obvious however. The issue of school discipline is a matter which reaches into almost every aspect of educational operation. Its causes are so widespread that no one solution can hope to solve the problem. The need for reasonable classroom learning atmosphere however, is indispensible to the climate of intellectual achievement and therefore cannot be ignored. As the problem is multi-faceted, the solutions proposed are numerous. We will now turn to an examination of various means to maintain a sound learning environment as they are expounded in the professional literature.

IV. Treatment of the Problem

The Hydra of school discipline must be attacked at each one of its several heads, a fact recognized by most informed people. It is surprising, therefore, how many persons believe that one panacea will solve the difficulty. Oversimplification of solutions may be one of the contributions to the continuance of the problem.

Many suggestions as to methods of reasonable class control can be found in English educational journals. As one would expect they come from a wide spectrum of persons in and out of the profession. They vary from quite theoretical, abstract proposals to the most immediate, short range, first aid type techniques for keeping a class attentive enough to teach and learn. They will be offered here in random order and without a claim of including every idea to be found in the literature. The great majority of such control measures, however, can be located in the following list.

1. "Sin Bins", isolation rooms in a school where disruptive pupils are placed for short periods usually not longer than three days. American Secondary schools often have similar facilities called "opportunity rooms","crisis rooms", etc. Lessons are conducted, generally by especially assigned senior staff members on a rotating basis.

2. Imposition of extra work, often copying apologies, ("lines"), additional subject matter reading or written reports.

3. Verbal rebuke, which can vary from mild to vicious, depending on the teacher, the pupil and the act involved.

4. Withdrawal of privileges, such as opportunity to play on school athletic teams, or to go on school trips, social events, etc.

5. Detention after school either with or without additional work involved. Parents may need to be consulted before detention is imposed because of problems this may cause in family functions.

6. Reference to headmaster/mistress. This is only used after the problem has passed through the pastoral care system and the deputy head(s) of the school. Serious discipline measures lie within the heads province such as corporal punishment and/or suspension.

7. Conference with parents are usually used if the problem is persistent or severe. The common difficulty here is that very often disruptive pupils have non-caring parents who refuse to come to school even in extraordinary circumstances.

8. Suspension of pupil, a measure which is used by the head and usually is imposed after consultation with other members of the staff. It lasts up to three days and generally the parents must accompany the pupil upon his/her return to school.

9. Expulsion of pupil. An extreme penalty which is employed only as a last resort. Approval for the action must come from the Board of Governors of the school and authorities from the Local Education Authority.

10. Transfer of pupil to another school. Such a course takes effect when there is reason to believe the pupil and the school will profit from such action. Often several schools have reciprocal agreements to give problem children another chance in another location.

11. Corporal punishment, a measure which extends from the more mild such as the ruler on palms of hands, through the "slipper" (a man's loafer shoe on the offenders backside) to the "cane". Although Inner London Education Authority has banned physical punishment, nearly all other authorities allow it

though few encourage it.

12. Transfer to special school or unit. This involves taking extremely disruptive children out of regular classroom and putting them in special groups either within the school or in another location. They are "mainstreamed" if/and when they are thought to be ready for a more normal class situation.

13. Pastoral care systems; the school organization which looks after the personal, social and academic welfare of all students. Each pupil is a member of a group outside the regular classroom. These are formed by dividing the whole student body into 4 to 8 large parts and those into smaller sections called tutor groups. Every group has its "tutor" who looks after the progress of the 20-30 children within his/her group. Counseling, friendly relations and constant care and interest make the pastoral care system an important facet of the disciplinary system of a school.

14. Individual timetable, the practice of creating a special class schedule for pupils who are disruptive because of an inability to fit into the regular pattern of classes and curriculum.

15. Remedial teaching makes provision for secondary school students who have continued problems with basic skills i.e. reading, writing, study skills, etc. These pupils' inability to cope with regular class assignments is sometimes expressed in minor forms of violence.

16. Counselling is often done by trained guidance personnel at comprehensive schools. These persons use a wide variety of tests and psychological procedures appropriate to each case, in addition to listening and giving advice to pupils.

17. "On Report System" refers to a process whereby a disruptive student is issued a "report card" which he/she carries to each lesson. Every teacher writes a comment on the pupils work and at the end of the day the youngster meets with a senior member of the staff to talk over what has happened

and, hopefully, to build a better attitude toward school and learning.

18. Social and other welfare agencies provide contacts with the home and community groups able to furnish information and help on family, employment, health and other matters which affect a pupils attitude toward school.

19. Special induction courses for all pupils in the first year of comprehensive school to help them settle well into the new academic environment.

20. Special teaching services such as classes in English as a Second Language or ethnic minority groups.

21. Work experience with on-the-job training is often coupled with a basic curriculum for less academicaliy inclined young people.

22. Case conferences on pupils with problems. These meetings aim at gathering information and setting a course of action which will help overcome the difficulty. Involved are such persons as the individual's teachers, pastoral care advisors, school counselors, social workers, heads and sometimes parents.

The above list, while not exhaustive, is quite comprehensive and includes most of the pedagogical and administrative methods used by comprehensive schools to deal with disruptive students. Readers who are familiar with American secondary schools will recognize many of the approaches mentioned here. Several, however, stand out as novel and may provide new avenues of approach to American schools coping with problems of indiscipline. Among these are the following:

1. The "On Report" system
2. Individual timetable
3. Pastoral care system
4. Corporal punishment (mentioned here as different because of its official status in English comprehensive schools - no implication of endorsement should be assumed)

The most profound difference between the English and American secondary school in the matter of handling discipline problems is the pastoral care

organization. I heartily endorse it as a most viable and helpful means of not only dealing with disruptive pupils but of making the school a caring and personal institution for all its students.

IV. Design of This Study

The purpose of this investigation, as outlined in the first section of the paper, is to look closely at how English comprehensive schools deal with problems of classroom disruption in the hope of discovering approaches which could be useful to American public secondary schools faced with a similar difficulty. In pursuing this goal I have taken the following steps to secure a current and accurate picture of the situation.

First, I spent several weeks at the Education Library of the Department of Education and Science, a branch of the British civil service under the Minister of Education and Science. All of the books available there relating to the subject were studied and relevant ideas noted. In addition most of the periodical literature as listed in the British Education Index was read. By doing this, a factual and conceptual foundation was gained which helped me gain insight and perspective on the issue.

It is easy, in dealing with a matter such as this, to become locked in the "ivory tower." To obtain a realistic view of the problem, a second step was taken by making a number of visits to comprehensive schools in various parts of the country. It was possible to talk to teaching faculty, school administrators and personnel from the central L.E.A. offices. This interchange was very helpful in understanding attitudes, feelings, programs and techniques of dealing with classroom disruption from persons in various positions of responsibility.

The final step toward obtaining a clear picture of the issue was to find out the current thinking of those actually confronted with the problem on a day-to-day basis. This was accomplished through a questionnaire survey of teachers and administrators in English comprehensive schools.

In order to obtain an adequate and unbiased sample the following measures were taken:

1. A "frame" of all English comprehensive schools from the Department of Education and Science was employed to select a proper sample.

2. Only "mixed" (coeducational), "all through" (generally students from roughly 7th grade to 12th grade) type schools were used in the poll. This made the sample quite comparable to American secondary schools.

3. The basic request for responses was sent to headmasters/mistresses asking them to fill in a questionnaire themselves and select 6 staff members to also complete the form. Each head was encouraged to pass the forms to a diverse cross-section of school personnel including variations in sex, experience & subject area.

4. Individual return envelopes were provided so that any possible influence which might be felt if the head returned all responses would be eliminated.

5. Before school heads could ever be contacted it was necessary for the Chief Education Officer of each L.E.A. to give his/her permission. Out of the 97 such officials a total of 70 allowed such an approach to the heads of comprehensive schools.

6. The Department of Education and Science list of comprehensive schools (1980)[10] contained 3222 such institutions of which 1240 were "all-through mixed" schools. These were used as the actual sample potential when they were included in those L.E.A.'s which allowed me to approach heads with the research proposal.

7. A total of 125 schools received cover letters and questionnaires (one for the head or deputy and 6 for classroom teachers. This amounts to a 10% sampling and was selected by polling each 10th school on the list. A total of 875 questionnaires were sent.

9. Department of Education and Science, Addresses of Local Education Authorities In England, 1980, London, 1980 pp. 3-19.
10. Department of Education & Science, List of 3222 Comprehensive Schools, Typed list. London 1980. 66 pages.

8. Nearly all the mailing was completed by April 9, 1981 and returns were received by May 30, 1981.

9. At that date a total of 465 usable responses had been received, amounting to a 53.14 per cent of return.

10. Sample forms of the cover letter, an added explanatory note and the questionnaire will be found in the Appendix.

The details of research design described above have been given to show the efforts I made to obtain an accurate picture of the phenomonon being investigated. Polls and surveys can be misleading unless complete information on the methodology used is revealed. I have been as candid as possible in this matter so you can have faith in the figures which appear in the following section.

V. Teachers and Administrators View Classroom Disruption in Comprehensive Schools

We now turn to the substance of the survey responses. This material provides new information on a number of important areas relating to the general matter of classroom disruption in comprehensive schools. Only overall totals, interesting sub-group variations and often mentioned comments will be included in this section. Complete figures for all questions and all comments will be found in the Appendix.

These results will be divided into 3 general categories for more convenient analysis.

1. Demographic information on:
   - A. Types of L.E.A.'s in which respondents teach.
   - B. Position of respondent
   - C. Sex of respondent
   - D. Teaching subject of respondent
   - E. Size of school of respondent
   - F. Length of experience of respondent
   - G. Size of community of respondent

2. Teacher and administrator feeling about classroom disruption

   A. Extent of disruption problem

   B. Changes in severity of problem

   C. Types of troublesome pupil behavior.

   D. Causes of disruptive behavior

   E. Factors in controlling disruptive behavior.

   F. Most important factors in control.

3. Teacher, administrator suggestions on reduction of classroom disruption.

The method of dealing with the material will be to first provide an introductory statement on each matter listed above. Following that, tables of data will be included and finally, a brief analysis of the information will conclude each section.

Demographic Information

The following tables give information on the types of persons responding to the survey, their teaching duties and something of the schools and communities in which they work. The hope was that the sample would be widely representative of the teaching and administrative personnel of all through comprehensive schools. The way the form was structured makes it possible to note variations in sub-groups. The results will be presented in table form with general totals indicated. After that, variations of a substantial nature will be included and commonly mentioned comments by respondents will be listed. (N.B., In noting variations among sub-groups, the several categories with small response totals will not be considered.)

Table I
Location of Respondents

Type of Location	L.E.A.'s Represented	Number of Respondents
London and Environs	9	73
Metropolitan Boroughs (Non-London)	12	111
Counties	20	281
Totals	41	465

Analysis

Responses were received from the three general categories of locations fixed by the Department of Education and Science.[11] Of the 97 existing L.E.A.'s, replies came from 41 giving a 42% coverage of potential locations. If Table I, Appendix is consulted, it can be seen that all areas of the country are represented from North to South and East to West. A total of 875 questionnaires were mailed out with 465 completed forms being returned. The percentage of response amounts to 53.1%. This is not quite enough to warrant inference to the general population of comprehensives but does reflect the situation in many schools all over England. As such, it does indicate widely held feelings and therefore merits consideration in thinking about the subject.

Table 2
Question: "In what type of school are you employed?"

Type of School	Percentage
Mixed School	100.0
Boys School	0.0
Girls School	0.0

11. Ibid. pp. 1-66

Analysis

As has been previously mentioned, all the schools polled were coeducational since Americans public secondary schools enroll both sexes. The factor of pupil sex would be similar allowing a more valid comparison between American and English schools to be made than if some single sex schools were included in the sample from England.

* *

In an effort to assess any potential differences in thinking about classroom disruption respondents were categorized according to their principal function in the school. It should be noted that in English schools teachers often assume some administrative function. Such positions as "head of faculty", "head of house", "department head", etc. were classified as classroom teacher. The desire was to separate responses of those whose primary duty was administrative from those whose primary duty was teaching. I'm sure some English educators will feel violence to the truth has been done here, but to make a comparison more meaningful to Americans this step had to be taken.

The "other" category consisted of full-time guidance counselors.

Table 3

Question: What is your position in the school?

Position	Percentage
Headmaster/mistress or principal	15.7
Deputy Head	13.5
Classroom Teacher	69.1
Other	.8

Analysis

This is quite straightforward showing the great majority of respondents to be classroom teachers and the remainder administrators.

* *

It was only with fear and trepidation that I included this question in the poll. In this era of womens liberation, such an inquiry might be considered impertinent or unecessary. The matter of instructor sex could be a significant consideration in the way teachers view classroom disruption, so it was left in the questionnaire.

Table 4

Question: For purposes of analysis of a very important variable would you please indicate your sex?

Sex	Percentage
Female	37.3
Male	61.4

Analysis

The difference in percentage of male and female response could be due to several reasons:

1. There are fewer female teachers in comprehensive schools
2. Fewer females could have been chosen by heads to fill in the questionnaire.
3. The female teachers might have resented the question and refused to cooperate in what they considered a sexist enterprise.

I have no way of knowing how accurately this breakdown reflects the actual percentage of male-female teacher corps. At any rate we do have the replies of 174 women teachers which should provide a good sample of their feelings.

* *

The classification of teachers according to their subject matter responsibilities was another factor thought to be worthwhile because of potential differences in attitudes. The "other" category included mostly teachers of drama, permanent substitutes and special education instructors. One interesting difference in American and English thinking surfaced in regard to what we consider to be "social science". Several respondents in geography and history did not

feel they were social science instructors. One person became so exercized that he/she wrote "you forget the most important subject - HISTORY. Clod!"

Table 5

Question: (For classroom teachers only) In what general subject matter area is your primary teaching responsibility?

Subject Area	Percentage
Art	4.7
English language and literature	13.4
Foreign language	6.5
Industrial arts, home economics, secretarial studies	9.0
Mathematics	15.5
Music	0.9
Physical education	7.8
Religious studies	3.4
Science	13.0
Social science	19.6
Other	5.6

Analysis

Almost every subject area is represented in the replies shown in this table. Only 3 music teachers returned the form so that sample cannot be considered too valid. How closely this percentage corresponds to the total percentage actually teaching in the various disciplines, is not known. Once again, however, it does reflect wide sampling of diverse teaching specialities and

provides insight on this matter.

* *

The question of whether or not classroom disruption problems were different depending on school size was one which could have a bearing on the matter. Schools were classified into "small", "medium sized" and "large". Answers to later questions will include this sub-group.

Table 6

Question: What is the enrollment of your school?

Enrollment	Percentage
Under 500 pupils	1.1
500 - 1000 pupils	40.3
Over 1000 pupils	57.3

Analysis

It appears that there are very few comprehensive schools with enrollments of fewer than 500 pupils. This may be a reflection of response patterns. There are enough replies from "medium sized" and "large" schools to indicate whether this has an effect on the extent and kind of classroom disruption.

* *

Certainly one of the most important variables in examining school personnel feelings about classroom disruption is experience. Here again, three divisions were set up to categorize the extent of time respondents have dealt with the problem under consideration.

Table 7

Question: How long have you been employed in secondary schools?

Length of Employment	Percentage
1-3 years	14.8
4-10 years	24.5
Over 10 years	59.9

Analysis

Each experience group is represented by a substantial response from the sample attempted. Whether or not the percentage of respondents in each category is similar to the actual experience level in comprehensive schools is unknown. Enough replies were received, however, to make possible some interesting comparisons.

* *

The last influence on answer variation was the matter of community size. There is some feeling among knowledgable people that discipline problems are greater in larger cities. For this reason the community size factor was included in the questionnaire.

Table 8

Question: In what sized community is your school located?

Community Size	Percentage
Under 25,000	22.5
25,000 - 100,000	43.1
Over 100,000	32.0

Analysis

Each size category contains enough responses to show any differences in attitudes which might be due to variations in community size. If these differences appear to be significant they will be noted in the analysis of each of the questions which follow.

* *

The first question which would legitimately be asked about classroom disruption is, how much of a problem is it? In replying, a number of people indicated they were speaking of their own schools alone. In phrasing the question,

I hoped that those responding would be influenced in their answers by their own experiences and also by what they knew from their own professional relationships with other teachers and schools.

Table 9

Question: How would you assess the extent of classroom disruption in comprehensive schools?

Extent of Disruption	Percentage
Not really a problem	7.7
Only a mild difficulty	19.3
A problem but one which it is possible to cope with	67.8
A severe situation	3.6
Totally out of control	0.0

Interesting variations among sub-groups:

"A severe situation:"

Mathematics teachers - 14%

"A problem but one with which it is possible to cope:"

Art Teachers - 87.7%

English Teachers - 55.8%

Religious Studies Teachers - 45.5%

Comments

"Answer refers to one school only" - 27

"Wide variation in schools" - 20

"Depends on many factors" - 7

"Worse in inner-city areas" - 3

"Depends on catchment area" - 3

"Problem confined to a few disruptive pupils" - 3

"Situation deteriorating" - 2

"Increasing problem - only with lowest ability classes" - 2

Comments, cont.

"Not all members of staff can or want to cope" - 2

"Smaller schools have fewer problems" - 2

Analysis

The great majority of respondents believe classroom disruption is a problem in comprehensive schools but one which can be controlled. A few felt it was not a serious problem but no one rated it "out of control." Only the mathematics teachers looked upon it as "severe," while art teachers ranked it considerable more of a difficulty than the total group mean. Somewhat less alarmed were English teachers and religious studies teachers. In general, the overall response indicated real concern but by no means despair. The dynamics of the situation were sought in responses to the next question. Whether the problem is moving toward resolution is a very important factor in attitude as well as the necessity for prompt and effective action.

* *

Table 10

Question: In what direction do you believe classroom disruption has been moving during your experience in comprehensive schools?

Direction	Percentage
Becoming less severe	8.7
Remaining about the same	49.3
Becoming more severe	40.4

Interesting variations among sub-groups:

"Less severe" - not much difference among sub-groups

"About the same:"

Headmasters/mistresses - 60.3%

Religious Studies Teachers - 36.4%

Science Teachers - 64.3%

Teachers of 1-3 years experience - 62.3%

"More severe"

English Teachers - 27.9%

Science Teachers - 26.2%

Comments

"Reflects decline in social conditions" - 7

"Answer refers to one school only" - 6

"Less parental care = more disruption in schools" - 4

"Teaching experience reduces number of problems" - 4

"Varies according to school" - 3

"Anti-authoritarian attitude" - 3

"Only a few disruptive pupils can spoil a good class" - 3

"In inner-city schools with high immigrant population" - 2

"Prospect of unemployment influences pupils to disregard lessons and examinations" - 2

"More severe only in recent year or two" - 2

Analysis

While about half of the replies showed school personnel believe classroom disruption to be rather static almost as many felt it was becoming a more severe problem. Only a few rated it as less severe. A number of the sub-groups ranked it more stable than the total group. Among these were heads, young teachers and teachers of science. English teachers were less inclined than other sub-groups to worry about deterioration of class discipline.

It is obvious that nearly all school people do not believe classroom disruption is lessening. Nearly as many feel that it is becoming more of a problem as think that it is remaining stable.

* *

In pursuing the matter of disruptive pupil behavior in schools it is not enough to realize it is a problem. Inquiry was made about what types of activities

cause difficulty. This question was asked and respondents ranked a number of activities as to how severe they were in maintaining classroom order. In case not all common disorder problems were listed, additional items were requested from those replying to the survey.

Table 11

Question: Please rate the following types of troublesome pupil behavior in comprehensive schools according to their effect on reasonable order.

Use: 1=A serious problem, 2=A moderate problem, 3=A slight problem, 4=No problem at all

Type of Problem	Extent	Percentage
Inappropriate talking	Serious	7.1
	Moderate	41.8
	Slight	43.1
	No Problem	6.2
Other inattention	Serious	4.9
	Moderate	33.8
	Slight	52.2
	No Problem	7.2
Impertinence	Serious	11.6
	Moderate	31.8
	Slight	47.4
	No Problem	8.6
Abusive talk to teacher	Serious	21.9
	Moderate	16.1
	Slight	35.4
	No Problem	25.8
Physical violence to other pupils	Serious	19.7
	Moderate	17.6
	Slight	39.3
	No Problem	22.3
Physical violence to teacher	Serious	23.6
	Moderate	3.6
	Slight	14.8
	No Problem	56.7
Making inappropriate noises	Serious	4.3
	Moderate	22.8
	Slight	51.3
	No Problem	19.8
Aggressive Behavior among pupils	Serious	13.1
	Moderate	32.2
	Slight	39.5
	No Problem	13.7
Hyper-activity	Serious	4.9
	Moderate	23.4
	Slight	43.9
	No Problem	25.8

Interesting variations among sub-groups:

"Impertinence"

Serious Problem - Math Teachers - 22%

"Abusive talk to Teacher"

Serious Problem - Industrial Arts, Home Economics, Secretarial Studies Teachers - 37.9%

No Problem - English Teachers - 41.9%

Foreign Language Teachers - 38.1%

"Physical Violence to other pupils"

Serious Problem - Industrial Arts, Home Economics, Secretarial Studies Teachers - 31.0%

No Problem - Art Teachers - 6.7%

Phy Ed Teachers 8.0%

"Physical Violence to teacher"

Serious Problem - Industrial Arts, Home Economics, Secretarial Studies Teachers - 34.5%

No Problem - Math Teachers - 42.0%

"Making inappropriate noises"

No Problem - Art Teachers - 33.3%

English Teachers - 32.6%

"Aggressive Behavior Among Pupils"

No Problem - 34.9%

"Hyperactivity"

Moderate Problem - Art Teachers - 46.7%

Slight Problem - Science Teachers - 61.9%

No Problem - Foreign Language Teachers - 42.9%

Comments

"Complacency and apathy" - 8

"Answer refers to one school" only - 7

Comments, cont.

"Casual truancy" - 5

"Unwillingness to do work" - 5

"Lack of direction, ambition, etc." - 3

"Pupils late to class - leads to conflict with teacher" - 3

"Lack of teacher competence" - 2

"Attention seeking" - 2

"Social incompetence" (of pupils) - 2

"Damage to school fabric and equipment" - 2

Analysis

None of the causes listed for ranking appear to constitute a serious problem to school personnel as a whole or to any of the constituent subgroups. No suggested additional causes mentioned under "other" were listed by more than a few respondents. Among the causes of disruption only a few were given as "moderate" problems by large numbers of those replying to the survey.

It almost appears that while teachers seem to be concerned about discipline problems in general and many feel the situation is worsening, teachers and administrators were unable or unwilling to be specific.

* *

When we try to identify the causes of disruptive pupil behavior in schools, we are approaching the real heart of the matter. In Question 12 respondents were asked to rank ten causes in four categories of importance. Additional causes were solicited.

Table 12

Question: Please rate the following causes of disruptive behavior in comprehensive schools.

Use: 1=An important cause, 2= A moderate cause, 3=A slight cause, 4=Not a cause.

Cause	Importance	Percentage
Peer Pressure	Important	35.6
	Moderate	30.7
	Sligh	26.0
	Not a cause	6.0
Lack of Interest in subject	Important	30.7
	Moderate	44.8
	Slight	22.1
	Not a cause	1.7
Inability to do classwork	Important	21.9
	Moderate	35.2
	Slight	35.0
	Not a cause	7.1
Revolt against adult authority	Important	20.8
	Moderate	32.6
	Slight	36.7
	Not cause	9.4
General disinterest in school	Important	30.5
	Moderate	41.8
	Slight	25.5
	Not a cause	1.5
Unsettled home environment	Important	49.6
	Moderate	31.5
	Slight	16.7
	Not a cause	1.1
Dislike of teacher	Important	12.7
	Moderate	31.3
	Slight	43.3
	Not a cause	11.4
Use of drugs	Important	4.9
	Moderate	4.6
	Slight	15.6
	Not a cause	72.8
Lack of Self Esteem	Important	13.7
	Moderate	27.5
	Slight	41.0
	Not a cause	16.5

Cause	Importance	Percentage
Pupil Psychological or Emotional Instability	Important	29.4
	Moderate	30.9
	Slight	32.6
	Not a cause	5.4

Interesting variations among sub-groups:

"Peer pressure"

Important Cause - Heads - 49.3%

Phy Ed Teachers - 48.0%

"Inability to do classwork"

Important cause - English teachers - 34.9%

"Revolt against adult authority"

Important cause - Foreign Language Teachers - 33.3%

Industrial Arts, Home Economics

Secretarial Studies Teachers - 31.0%

"General disinterest in school"

Important cause - Art Teachers - 46.7%

"Unsettled home environment"

Important cause - Phy Ed Teachers - 64.0%

Heads - 64.4%

"Dislike of Teacher"

Important Cause - English Teachers - 25.6%

"Pupil psychological or emotional instability"

Important cause - Industrial Arts, Home Economics,

Secretarial Studies Teachers - 41.4%

Comments

"Lack of parental concern and support" - 15

"Lack of jobs - hence motivation" - 12

"General attitudes of society to all forms of authority" - 6

Comments, cont.

"Lack of relevance of many courses" - 4

"Depressing surroundings - old buildings" - 3

"Incompetence of staff" - 3

"Never met a drug case" - 3 headmasters

"Abusing equipment" - 3

"Classes too large - teachers cannot give individual attention" - 3

"Refers to one school only" - 3

Analysis

From all the possible causes suggested no single one was identified by a large majority of respondents as a primary reason for disruptive behavior. The most popular, "Unsettled home environment" was selected by half those replying. One noticable difference between English and American schools was the low rating given "Drug abuse" as a cause of discipline problems. When "Important" and "moderate" are lumped together most of the cause categories found support by the majority of school personnel. Reaction to the causes was frequently spread through these levels of importance indicating a considerable amount of disagreement on the weight given to each reason.

* *

After seeking opinions on types and causes of classroom disruptive behavior, the next logical question deals with crucial factors in controlling the problem. In gathering this information, a large number of possible influences were listed and these were ranked according to their importance. Additional factors not provided in the questionnaire were solicited from respondents.

Table 13 (a)

Question: Please rate the following factors as to their influence in controlling disruptive pupil behavior.
Use: 1=Very important, 2=Moderately important, 3=Of slight importance, 4=Of no importance

Factor	Importance	Percentage
Positive Teacher Personality	Very	89.7
	Moderately	7.3
	Slight	2.1
	No	0.4
Effective Teaching Methods	Very	87.6
	Moderately	10.5
	Slight	1.5
	No	0.2
Strict Disciplinary Measures by Teacher	Very	39.9
	Moderately	44.4
	Slight	12.0
	No	1.8
Type of School Population	Very	32.8
	Moderately	44.2
	Slight	17.4
	No	4.5
Pastoral Care Program	Very	40.3
	Moderately	40.1
	Slight	16.5
	No	2.1
Influence of Headmaster/mistress or Principal	Very	56.0
	Moderately	30.3
	Slight	11.6
	No	0.9
Support of School by Parents	Very	68.7
	Moderately	23.4
	Slight	6.0
	No	1.1
Corporal Punishment	Very	14.6
	Moderately	25.8
	Slight	38.8
	No	20.2
Streaming of Pupils by Academic Ability	Very	16.3
	Moderately	33.7
	Slight	27.9
	No	20.4
Firm support of Teacher Discipline Measures by Head of School	Very	70.8
	Moderately	20.7
	Slight	4.7
	No	2.6

Table 13 (a) cont.

Factor	Importance	Percentage
Special Classes for Unusually Disruptive Pupils	Very	26.8
	Moderately	32.8
	Slight	22.5
	No	15.8

Table 13 (b)

Question: Please rate the following factors as to their influence in controlling disruptive pupil behavior.
Use: 1=Very important, 2=Moderately important, 3=of slight importance, 4=Of no importance

Factor	Importance	Percentage
Expelling or Suspending Disruptive Pupils from School	Very	31.3
	Moderately	39.5
	Slight	21.7
	No	6.0
Help from the School Social Worker	Very	10.5
	Moderately	28.6
	Slight	38.0
	No	22.0
Reducing Academic Marks	Very	2.4
	Moderately	9.9
	Slight	26.4
	No	58.6
Witholding of Priveleges	Very	10.7
	Moderately	37.3
	Slight	36.5
	No	14.2
Parent - Teacher Conferences	Very	25.3
	Moderately	41.2
	Slight	26.2
	No	5.8
Appeal of Subject to Typical Pupil	Very	27.0
	Moderately	49.4
	Slight	15.8
	No	5.8
Age Level of Pupils	Very	19.5
	Moderately	39.8
	Slight	24.5
	No	14.2
Consistent Application of Behavior Standards to all pupils	Very	69.3
	Moderately	20.4
	Slight	6.7
	No	2.6
Establishing and Maintaining Behavior Standards Early On	Very	86.3
	Moderately	9.9
	Slight	2.1
	No	0.6

Table 13 (b) cont.

Factor	Importance	Percentage
Treating Causes of Behavior, Problems	Very	66.6
	Moderately	24.2
	Slight	6.4
	No	0.9
Availability of a Variety of Instructional Patterns in School	Very	34.3
	Moderately	39.5
	Slight	18.0
	No	6.3

Interesting variations among sub-groups:

"Strict disciplinary measures by teacher"

Very Important - Industrial Arts, Home Economics, Secretarial Studies Teachers - 55.2%
Teachers with 1-3 years Experience - 55.1%

"Type of school population"

Very Important - Industrial Arts, Home Economics, Secretarial Studies Teachers - 48.3%
Religious Studies Teachers - 45.5%

"Pastoral care program"

Very Important - Heads - 54.8%

"Influence of headmaster/mistress"

Very important - Art Teachers - 73.3%
English Teachers - 39.5%

"Support of school by parents"

Very important - Heads - 83.6%
Art Teachers - 40.0%
Phy Ed Teachers - 80.0%
Science Teachers - 50.0%

"Corporal punishment"

Very important - Art Teachers - 33.3%
Religious Studies Teachers - 27.3%

Moderate importance - Phy Ed Teachers - 48.0%

"streaming of pupils by academic ability

Very important - Math Teachers - 28.0%

"Special classes for disruptive pupils"

Of no importance - Heads - 31.5%
Phy Ed Teachers - 4.0%

"Expelling or suspending disruptive pupils"

Very important - Art Teachers - 66.0%

Interesting variations among sub-groups: cont.

"Help from school social worker"

Very important - Art Teachers - 33.3%

"Reducing acadimic marks"

Of no importance - Phy Ed Teachers - 32.0%

"Witholding of priveleges"

Of no importance - Art Teachers - 33.3%

"Parent-teachers conferences"

Very important - Phy Ed Teachers - 44.0%

Heads - 37.0%

"Appeal of subject to typical pupil"

Very important - Industrial Arts, Home Economics, Secretarial Studies Teachers - 48.3%

"Consistent application of behavior standards"

Very important - Art Teachers - 46.7%

"Establishing behavior standards early on"

Very important - Art Teachers - 66.7%

"Treating causes of behavior problems"

Very important - Science Teachers - 52.4%

"Providing a variety of instructional patterns"

Very important - Math Teachers - 20.0%
Science Teachers - 21.4%

Comments

"Reduced class size" - 6

"Creation of a caring atmosphere" - 4

"Establishing good teacher-pupil relationships throughout school" - 4

"Organizing school to meet variety of needs instead of organizing students to meet variety of courses" - 3

"More welfare and psychological support" - 3

Comments, cont.

"Attractive surroundings" - 3

"Positive reinforcement for good behavior" - 3

"Availability of resources" - 3

"Teachers who can teach" - 2

"Visable dedication of teaching force" - 2

Analysis

Several ideas show very clearly in the reactions to factors which would help control disruptive pupil behavior. Nearly everyone agrees that teaching personality, teaching methods, and establishing and maintaining behavior standards early are essential. Strong endorsement is also given to support of the teacher by the head, support of the parents, consistent application of behavior standards and treating causes of problems. Rather surprisingly, much less agreement is found for such factors as special classes for unusually disruptive students, streaming, suspending or expelling disruptive pupils. These attitudes show the matters school personnel believe are important. Whether or not these situations actually exist in their schools is important but was not addressed by this questionnaire.

* *

Table 14

Question: Considering the factors listed in Question 13, please rank the five you consider to be most essential in maintaining acceptable classroom order in their range of importance.

Factor	Ranking
Positive Teacher Personality	1st
Effective Teaching Methods	2nd
Establishing and Maintaining Classroom Behavior Standards Early On.	3rd

Table 14, cont.

Factor	Ranking
Firm Support of Teacher Discipline Measures by Head of School	4th
Consistent Application of Behavior Standards to all Pupils	5th

Interesting variations among sub-groups:

The above ranking of factors essential in maintaining classroom discipline should include another item. "Support of school by parents" follows so closely the 5th rated factor, that they are in a virtual tie for 5th place. While these matters have drawn nearly universal agreement on their importance a few others gathered some minor strength. Among these are:

"Strict disciplinary measures by teacher" - 7th

"Pastoral care program" - 8th

"Treating causes of behavior problems" - 9th

"Appeal of subject to typical pupil"- 10th

* *

Table 15

Question: What suggestions would you offer to reduce the problem of classroom disruption? The statements have been put down verbation as they appeared on the returned forms. While not every wording was exactly the same, those in close agreement with the substance of the suggestion were grouped together.

(N.B. Only the most mentioned suggestions will be listed here. All the others can be found in the Appendix)

Suggestion	Number of Times Mentioned
"Reasonable numbers in classes"	71
"High standard of behavior, work and discipline expected by staff and 100% effort toward this goal"	31
"Insure that examination dominated curriculum is relevant to all pupils"	30

Table 15, cont.

Suggestion	Number of Times Mentioned
"Raise entry standards for teaching"	30
"Better teacher training"	26
"More human, mature relationships among staff and pupils"	25
"Force parents to be more responsible for their childrens' behavior - withdraw (welfare) benefits, etc.	20
"Replace ineffective teachers"	18
"Well-planned, interesting lessons"	14
"More relevant, interesting, activity-based classwork	14
"Lower school - leaving age"	13
"Strong support and leadership from headmaster"	12
"More adequate teaching resources"	12
"A consistent, stable and committed teacher who admits to mistakes but will work on his own and his pupils weaknesses"	12
"In-service teacher training"	11
"Reduce size of schools"	11
"Closer liaison with parents"	11
"Consistent, fair and just standards of behavior and punishments"	10

Analysis

While one suggestion, that of smaller class size, was by far the most popular,

Analysis, cont.

most of the others dealt with teachers, teaching and the curriculum. It appears that most respondents believe that much could be done to reduce disruptive pupil behavior by concentrating on selecting high quality persons for teaching, educating them well, and concentrating on effective teaching of a worthwhile, relevant curriculum.

VI Summary and Conclusions

This study of disruptive behavior in English comprehensive schools was undertaken with the hope of learning from their experience some insights, attitudes and approaches which could be useful to American educators. In an effort to be fair, comprehensive and accurate, I examined several areas relating to the issue. A number of crucial questions were raised and answers were recorded. Among them were the following:

What is the problem?

How widespread is the difficulty in both English and American schools?

How similar and different are English and American comprehensive secondary schools?

What does the literature tell us about the problem?

What is the current feeling of English comprehensive school personnel about the extent, movement, types, causes and factors of control related to classroom disruption?

What suggestions would English teachers and administrators offer to improve the situation?

In closing this report a number of concluding statements will be made which appear warranted by the information the study has revealed.

1. Using oblique measures such as numbers of articles and books on the subject, statements of concern by teachers groups, etc., plus a few rather out-of-date studies, it may be inferred that classroom discipline is believed to be a real problem in English comprehensive schools.

2. The American public and teacher groups feel strongly that pupil disruption is a very serious matter, as public polls and the mass of literature will testify.
3. Many similarities exist between English and American systems of comprehensive secondary education. This situation permits a reasonable consideration of potential transfer of ideas on classroom disruption between the two systems.
4. Among the significant differences between the two institutions are those which merit special note.
   A. The "pastoral care programs" which are a part of every English comprehensive school and have no counterpart in American secondary schools.
   B. The teaching duties which nearly all English headmasters/mistresses assume <u>in addition</u> to the administrative work they do.
   C. The examination system English pupils fact at age 15+ and 18+, which tends to control much of the curriculum and which many fail or do not bother taking at all.
5. The litany of reasons for discipline problems in English schools, as found in the literature, reads much the same as that for American schools. We obviously have similar difficulties and tend to place blame for them on many of the same doorsteps.
6. The "cures" set forth in professional media are also much the same as those in the United States. Two exceptions are the use in English schools of:
   A. The pastoral care program
   B. The use or threat of corporal punishment.

7. The survey used to obtain up-to-date reactions to the matter polled a wide spectrum of schools. The respondents were stratified on the basis of several categories for purposes of comparison.
8. The percentage of response was 53.1% and represents reaction from many parts of the country and all types of L.E.A.'s.
9. Classroom disruption is viewed as a serious but not a critical matter by English comprehensive school personnel. Very few felt sanguine about it but nobody dispaired.
10. The dynamics of the problem caused greater concern than the present situation. Many more believed disruption is growing in severity than feel it is lessening. Half the respondents indicated it is neither becoming better nor getting worse.
11. When asked to identify kinds of troublesome behavior those replying did not view any of those suggested as of a serious nature. Most were ranked as "moderate" or "slight". This is puzzling when compared to the feeling that classroom disruption is a serious problem and either remaining stable or becoming worse. I am at a loss to explain this.
12. Again, when asked to identify causes for discipline problems, only one, "unsettled home environment" was thought by even half the respondents to be "Important". When coupled with "moderate", most causes were believed to influence classroom behavior, however.
13. Substantial agreement as to the factors which control disruptive pupil behavior was evident. Nearly everyone thought an instructor with a positive personality, using effective

13. cont.

methods, establishing behavior standards early and applying them consistently with the firm support of his/her headmaster/mistress would be likely to have few disruption problems. The indication is clear that a good teacher with help from the head should be able to handle school discipline. Special administrative measures do not appear to provide the best answers to most respondents.

14. When asked for suggestions to reduce discipline problems many teachers uttered the familiar (and often warranted) cry, "Give us fewer students!" Many of the remaining ideas mentioned dealt with the quality of teachers and instruction. One teacher answered: "Bring back the death penalty" and another wrote, "Select teachers with a streak of genial brutality."

15. It was surprising to note how closely respondents agreed in many of their answers. While a moderate amount of variations was evident on a few questions, agreement was far more substantial than anticipated. It did not matter significantly in most instances whether the person was a head or teacher, male or female, experienced or new, from large or moderate-sized schools or located in big or smaller communities. This unanimity, while less interesting than widespread differences, does provide for more faith in the reliability of the responses.

In concluding this report, it can be seen that while the problem is viewed as serious and not improving, the answer can be found in better teachers and teaching. Some divergent thinking was evident and viewpoints varied in several respects. The help and support of heads and parents was believed to be very important but in the last analysis, we have come back to salvation where matters

began - the classroom teacher

APPENDIX

TABLE I

LOCATION OF RESPONDENT	NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS	
London & Environs 9 LEAs		
Brent	5	
Bromley	6	
Havering	3	
Hillingdon	15	
Hounslow	11	
Newham	6	
Redbridge	7	
Richmond - on - Thames	6	
Inner London	14	73
Metropolitan Boroughs (Non-London) 12 LEAs		
Bolton	5	
Manchester	6	
Knowsley	7	
Sefton	12	
Birmingham	25	
Solihull	5	
Walsall	14	
Wolverhampton	13	
Newcastle-on-Tyne	4	
South Tyneside	5	
Sheffield	14	
Wirral	1	111
County 20 LEAs		
Cheshire	26	
Cleveland	7	
Cumbria	9	
Derbyshire	25	
Durham	14	
Hampshire	7	
Herefordshire and Worcester	6	
Isle of Wight	5	
Kent	6	
Lancashire	7	
Leistershire	4	
Norfolk	6	
North Yorkshire	14	
Nottinghamshire	29	
Oxfordshire	11	
Staffordshire	22	
Suffolk	7	
Wiltshire	17	
Glovcestershire	14	
Hertfordshire	42	
No Answer	3	281
Total 41 LEAs		465

Table II

In what type of school are you employed?	
Mixed, comprehensive secondary school	465

Table III

"What is your position in the school?"

Position	Number	Percentage
Headmaster/mistress	73	15.7
Deputy head	63	13.5
Classroom teacher	322	69.1
Other	4	0.8

Table IV

"Please indicate your sex"

Sex	Number	Percentage
Female	174	37.3
Male	286	61.4

Table V

"(For classroom teachers only) In what general subject matter area is your primary teaching responsibility?"

Subject	Number	Percentage
Art	15	4.7
English	43	13.4
Foreign Language	21	6.5
Industrial arts, home econ. secondary studies	29	9.0
Mathematics	50	15.5
Music	3	0.9
Physical education	25	7.8
Religious studies	11	3.4
Science	42	13.0
Social Studies	63	19.6
Others	18	5.6

Table VI

"What is the enrollment of your school?"

Enrollment	Number	Percentage
Under 500 pupils	5	1.1
500 - 1000 pupils	188	40.3
Over 1000 pupils	267	57.3

Table VII

"How long have you been employed in secondary schools?

Years	Number	Percentage
1-3 years	69	14.8
4-10 years	114	24.5
Over 10 years	279	59.9

Table VIII

"In what sized community is your school located?"

Community Size	Number	Percentage
Under 25,000	105	22.5
25,000 - 100,000	201	43.1
Over 100,000	149	32.0

Table IX

"How would you asses the extent of classroom disruption in comprehensive schools?"

	Position				Sex		Subject Area										
	(73)	(68)	(322)	(4)	(174)	(286)	(15)	(43)	(21)	(29)	(50)	(3)	(25)	(11)	(42)	(63)	(18)
Extent	Head	Deputy	Classroom Teacher	Other	Female	Male	Art	English	Foreign Language	Ind. Arts, Home Ec., etc.	Math	Music	Phy. Ed.	Relig. Stud.	Science	Social Studies	Other
Not really a problem	8.2	6.3	7.8	0.0	9.2	7.0	6.7	13.9	4.8	6.9	6.0	0.0	8.0	9.1	7.8	7.9	11.1
Only a mild difficulty	28.8	20.6	17.4	0.0	16.1	21.7	0.0	25.6	19.0	10.3	20.0	0.0	12.0	27.3	14.3	17.5	22.2
A problem but one with which it is possible to cope	61.6	71.4	68.6	100	70.1	66.4	86.7	55.8	76.2	72.4	58.0	100	72.0	45.5	76.2	73.0	66.6
A severe situation	0.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	4.0	3.1	0.0	4.7	0.0	6.9	14.0	0.0	4.0	9.1	4.8	1.6	0.0
Totally out of control	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Table IX (cont.)

"How would you assess the extent of classroom disruption in comprehensive schools?"

	School Size			Community Size			Experience			
	(5)	(188)	(269)	(105)	(201)	(149)	(69)	(114)	(279)	
Extent	Under 500	500-1000	Over 1000	Under 25,000	25,000 - 100,000	Over 100,000	1-3 years	4-10 years	Over 10 years	Total
Not really a problem	0.0	7.9	6.7	5.7	8.5	8.1	2.9	9.6	7.9	7.7
Only a mild difficulty	0.0	23.9	16.9	17.1	20.9	18.1	20.3	13.2	21.5	19.3
A problem but one with which it is possible to cope	100	62.8	71.9	72.4	64.2	71.1	73.9	69.3	66.7	67.8
A severe situation	0.0	2.7	4.1	2.9	5.5	1.3	2.9	6.1	2.5	3.6
Totally out of control	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

COMMENTS: QUESTION 9

COMMENT	NUMBER OF TIMES COMMENT MADE
Answer refers to one school only	27
Wide variation in schools	20
Depends on many factors	7
Problem confined to a few disruptive pupils	3
Depends on catchment area	3
Worse in inner city areas	3
Situation deteriorating	2
Increasing problem - only with lowest ability classes	2
Experienced teacher can cope with 99% of problems	2
Not all members of staff can or want to cope	2
Depends on relationship between pupils and individual teacher	2
Smaller schools have fewer problems	2
Problem is not so much disruption as apathy - lack of attention, etc.	1
Cooperation among members of staff in required	1
Depends on head and staff	1
Problems due to reduction in staff	1
No different from other kinds of schools	1
The "them and us" attitude is disasterous	1
If disruption exists then it is not being coped with	1

Table X

"In what direction do you believe classroom disruption has been moving during your experience in comprehensive schools?"

	Position				Sex		Subject Area										
	Head (63)	Deputy (322)	Classroom Teacher (4)	Other (174)	Female (286)	Male (15)	Art (43)	English (21)	Foreign Language (29)	Ind. Arts Home Ec. (50)	Math (3)	Music (25)	Phy. Ed. (11)	Religious Studies (42)	Science (63)	Social Studies (18)	Other
Less Severe	9.6	12.7	7.8	0.0	9.2	8.7	0.0	16.3	14.3	3.4	0.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	7.1	14.3	11.1
About the Same	60.3	46.0	48.4	25.0	50.0	49.3	40.0	53.5	52.4	41.1	48.0	33.3	48.0	36.4	64.3	44.4	27.8
More Severe	30.1	41.3	42.2	75.0	40.2	40.6	53.3	27.9	33.3	55.2	52.0	66.7	48.0	45.5	26.2	41.3	55.6

	School Size			Experience			Community Size			
	Under 500 (5)	500-1000 (188)	Over 1000 (267)	1-3 Years (69)	4-10 Years (114)	Over 10 Years (279)	Under 25,000 (105)	25,000-100,000 (201)	Over 100,000 (149)	Total
Less Severe	20.0	8.5	8.6	5.8	9.6	9.3	8.6	7.5	11.4	8.7
About the Same	20.0	51.6	49.1	62.3	50.0	46.6	49.5	48.3	51.0	49.3
More Severe	60.0	38.3	41.5	29.0	38.6	43.7	40.0	43.2	36.9	40.4

Comments: Question 10

Comments	Number of Times Comment Made
Reflects decline in social conditions	7
Cannot generalize to all schools. Answer refers to one school only	6
Less parental care=More disruption in schools	4
Teaching experience reduces number of problems	4
Anti-authoritarian (attitude)	3
* Only a few disruptive pupils can spoil a good class	3
Becoming steadily more severe	2
Depends on teacher/pupil relationship	2
It is not severe	2
Sign of the times	2
Never a real problem in schools where I have worked	2
Reflects decline in social conditions	2
* In inner-city schools with high immigrant population	2
Prospect of unemployment influences pupils to disregard lessons and examinations	2
(Poor) quality of new teachers	2
* Only in recent year or two	2
Parental support for school has declined	1
In 7 years (of operating a comprehensive school) we have gained experience and confidence.	1
Improved when school moved from inner-urban to outer-urban area	1

Comments: Question 10
(cont.)

Comment	Number of Times Comment Made
Becoming more severe because of financial restrictions on staffing	1
Reaction against validity of examination system on achievement	1
* Worsening of economic and social situation major factors	1
* Schools and departments too large	1
* Physical rather than verbal	1
* Due mainly to poor control (by) teachers	1
"Less" in terms of extremes of behavior, "more" in terms of quantity of disruptive behavior	1
Depends on ones definition of disruptive behavior	1
* There seems to be an increasing number of individual problem children	1
The anti-social attitudes of some young people reflect conflict between traditional secondary education system and real needs of present day	1
Disillusionment of older teachers	1
* In common with CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE	1
** Reflects change in emphasis from stern authority to counseling	1
* Because of lack of back-up by school	1
* Pupils mistake freedom os speech as license	1
* Poor teacher training	1
* Increasing social and legal restraint on individual teachers to deal with his/her own problems	1

* (Severe)
** (Less Severe)

Table XI (a)

"Please rate the following types of troublesome pupil bahavior in comprehensive schools according to their effect of reasonable order"
Use: 1=Serious problem, 2=Moderate problem, 3=Slight problem, 4=No problem.

		Position				Sex		School Size			Experience			Community Size		
		(73)	(63)	(322)	(4)	(174)	(286)	(5)	(188)	(267)	(69)	(114)	(279)	(105)	(201)	(149)
	Importance	Head	Deputy	Classroom Teacher	Other	Female	Male	Under 500	500-1000	Over 1000	1-3 Years	4-10 Years	Over 10 Years	Under 25,000	25,000-100,000	Over 100,000
Inappropriate Talking	1	2.7	4.8	8.4	0.0	10.9	4.5	20.0	5.3	8.2	13.0	5.3	6.5	8.6	6.5	7.4
	2	46.6	42.9	40.4	75.0	44.8	40.6	60.0	40.4	42.3	33.3	43.9	43.4	39.0	41.3	46.3
	3	41.1	42.9	44.4	25.0	38.5	46.2	20.0	46.8	41.6	44.9	44.7	42.3	46.7	45.3	36.2
	4	9.6	7.9	5.0	0.0	4.0	7.3	0.0	6.4	6.0	4.3	5.3	6.8	4.8	5.5	8.1
Other Inattention	1	4.1	4.8	5.3	0.0	5.7	4.5	0.0	5.9	4.1	11.6	2.6	4.3	4.8	4.5	6.0
	2	39.7	31.7	32.9	50.0	38.5	31.1	60.0	32.4	34.8	20.3	35.1	36.6	37.1	31.3	35.6
	3	42.5	54.0	54.3	50.0	47.7	55.2	20.0	53.2	52.1	63.8	56.1	48.0	48.6	55.7	50.3
	4	13.7	7.9	5.6	0.0	6.3	7.7	0.0	7.4	7.1	4.3	5.3	8.6	7.6	7.5	5.4
Impertinence	1	9.6	7.9	12.7	0.0	10.3	12.2	0.0	12.2	11.2	17.4	13.2	9.3	12.4	12.4	8.7
	2	31.5	36.5	31.4	25.0	37.4	29.0	20.0	29.3	33.7	29.0	36.8	30.5	35.2	32.8	28.9
	3	54.8	47.6	45.3	75.0	44.3	49.0	60.0	48.4	47.2	44.9	40.4	51.6	49.5	42.8	54.4
	4	4.1	7.9	9.9	0.0	7.5	9.4	20.0	10.1	7.1	8.7	9.6	7.9	2.9	11.9	6.7
Abusive Talk to Teacher	1	16.4	25.4	22.7	25.0	22.4	22.0	20.0	22.9	21.3	24.6	28.1	19.0	16.2	23.9	22.1
	2	16.4	19.0	15.5	0.0	12.6	18.2	0.0	15.4	16.5	17.4	18.4	14.0	21.0	16.4	12.8
	3	46.6	36.5	32.3	50.0	39.7	32.5	60.0	30.4	38.6	20.3	36.0	39.4	34.3	32.8	40.9
	4	20.5	19.0	28.6	25.0	24.1	26.9	20.0	31.4	22.5	37.7	17.5	26.5	28.6	26.4	22.8
Physical Violence to other Pupils	1	12.3	17.5	22.0	25.0	21.8	18.9	0.0	19.1	20.6	23.2	26.3	16.1	13.3	22.9	19.5
	2	21.9	23.8	14.9	25.0	16.7	17.8	0.0	15.4	18.7	13.0	21.1	17.2	18.1	19.9	13.4
	3	52.1	38.1	36.6	50.0	36.8	40.6	60.0	39.4	39.7	30.4	28.1	46.2	46.7	33.3	45.0
	4	13.7	19.0	25.5	0.0	23.6	22.0	40.0	25.5	19.9	33.3	24.6	19.0	21.9	22.9	20.8
Physical Violence to Teacher	1	16.4	27.0	24.8	25.0	24.7	23.1	0.0	23.4	24.0	29.0	30.7	19.4	17.1	24.4	26.2
	2	2.7	0.0	4.0	0.0	2.3	4.7	20.0	2.7	3.4	4.3	5.3	2.5	4.8	2.5	3.4
	3	19.2	14.3	13.7	50.0	13.8	15.7	20.0	14.4	15.0	13.0	7.9	17.9	15.2	13.9	15.8
	4	61.6	58.7	55.9	25.0	57.5	56.3	60.0	59.0	56.2	53.6	56.1	58.4	62.9	57.7	52.3
Making Inappropriate Noises	1	2.7	0.0	5.3	0.0	5.2	3.5	0.0	2.7	4.5	7.2	3.5	3.2	6.7	3.5	3.4
	2	26.0	22.2	22.0	50.0	24.1	22.0	60.0	19.7	24.7	15.9	24.6	24.0	10.5	27.4	26.2
	3	52.1	60.3	50.0	50.0	53.4	50.7	0.0	52.7	52.4	56.5	50.0	50.9	62.9	48.8	46.3
	4	17.8	15.9	20.8	0.0	16.1	22.0	40.0	22.9	16.9	18.6	21.1	19.7	19.0	18.4	22.1
Aggressive Behavior Among Pupils	1	12.3	6.3	14.6	25.0	14.9	12.2	0.0	11.0	14.6	13.0	16.7	11.8	8.6	15.4	13.4
	2	31.5	32.9	30.4	50.0	34.5	31.1	40.0	30.9	33.3	37.7	32.5	31.2	33.3	33.8	29.5
	3	46.6	34.9	38.8	25.0	37.4	40.6	20.0	40.4	38.6	37.7	36.0	40.9	45.7	35.3	40.9
	4	9.6	14.3	14.6	0.0	11.5	15.0	40.0	15.4	12.4	11.6	14.0	14.3	10.5	14.9	14.1
Hyper-Activity	1	6.8	0.0	4.7	75.0	5.7	4.5	0.0	4.3	5.2	5.8	7.0	3.9	3.8	6.0	4.7
	2	17.8	15.9	25.8	25.0	27.0	21.3	0.0	22.3	24.0	27.5	27.2	20.1	21.0	25.9	20.1
	3	45.2	44.4	43.2	0.0	39.7	45.1	100	41.5	43.8	36.2	44.7	44.8	48.6	35.8	50.3
	4	28.8	36.5	23.6	0.0	23.6	27.3	0.0	29.3	24.3	29.0	19.3	28.0	25.7	29.4	21.5

Table XI (b)

"Please rate the following types of troublesome pupil behavior in comprehensive schools according to their effect on reasonable order." Use: 1=Serious problem, 2=Moderate problem, 3=Slight problem, 4=No problem.

Problem	Importance	Subject Area (15) Art	(43) English	(21) Foreign Lang.	(29) Ind. Arts Home Ec. etc.	(50) Math	(3) Music	(25) Phy. Ed.	(11) Religious Studies	(42) Science	(63) Social Studies	(18) Other	Total (Table XI a&b)
Inappropriate Talking	1	13.3	11.6	9.5	6.9	10.0	0.0	8.0	0.0	14.3	4.8	5.6	7.1
	2	33.3	46.5	38.1	37.9	36.0	33.3	44.0	36.4	38.1	41.3	38.9	41.8
	3	53.3	30.2	42.9	44.8	48.0	66.7	48.0	45.5	40.5	47.6	50.0	43.1
	4	0.0	7.0	0.0	10.3	4.0	0.0	0.0	18.2	7.1	4.8	5.6	6.2
Other Inattention	1	6.7	4.7	0.0	3.4	8.0	0.0	12.0	0.0	4.8	6.3	5.6	4.9
	2	20.0	41.9	33.3	31.0	26.0	66.7	40.0	18.2	45.2	22.2	38.9	33.8
	3	60.0	44.2	61.9	51.7	56.0	33.0	44.0	36.4	40.5	71.4	50.0	52.2
	4	0.0	7.0	4.8	3.4	10.0	0.0	4.0	27.3	9.5	0.0	5.6	7.2
Impertinence	1	6.7	9.3	14.3	10.3	22.0	0.0	16.0	0.0	9.5	12.7	5.6	11.6
	2	53.3	20.9	23.8	48.3	26.0	0.0	40.0	27.3	16.7	34.9	44.4	31.8
	3	33.3	48.8	57.1	37.9	42.0	100	40.0	45.5	57.1	42.9	50.0	47.4
	4	6.7	16.3	4.8	3.4	10.0	0.0	4.0	18.2	16.7	9.5	0.0	8.6
Abusive Talk to Teacher	1	20.0	14.0	9.5	37.9	30.0	0.0	28.0	9.1	14.3	25.4	16.7	21.9
	2	13.3	7.0	33.3	3.4	20.0	0.0	28.0	9.1	11.9	17.5	11.1	16.1
	3	53.3	34.9	19.0	41.4	20.0	100	36.0	27.3	23.8	33.3	50.0	35.4
	4	6.7	41.9	38.1	17.2	30.0	0.0	8.0	36.4	50.0	23.8	22.2	25.8
Physical Violence to Other Pupils	1	13.3	14.0	19.0	31.0	24.0	0.0	24.0	9.1	11.9	25.4	33.3	19.7
	2	26.7	16.3	14.3	13.8	22.0	0.0	16.0	18.2	11.9	12.7	11.1	17.6
	3	40.0	37.2	47.6	34.5	28.0	33.3	56.0	18.2	45.2	28.6	38.9	39.3
	4	20.0	30.2	19.0	17.2	26.0	66.7	4.0	36.4	31.0	33.3	16.7	22.3
Physical Violence to Teacher	1	20.0	14.0	23.8	34.5	26.0	0.0	28.0	9.1	19.0	31.7	27.8	23.6
	2	0.0	4.7	4.8	3.4	6.0	33.3	8.0	9.1	2.4	1.6	5.6	3.6
	3	20.0	14.0	9.5	3.4	26.0	0.0	12.0	9.1	7.1	14.3	11.1	14.8
	4	60.0	62.8	61.9	55.2	42.0	66.7	52.0	54.5	71.4	50.8	55.6	56.7
Making Inappropriate Noises	1	6.7	4.7	9.5	3.4	14.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.4	3.2	5.6	4.3
	2	20.0	20.9	23.8	27.6	16.0	33.3	40.0	18.2	26.2	9.5	22.2	22.8
	3	40.0	37.2	38.1	55.2	44.0	66.7	52.0	45.5	50.0	63.5	66.7	51.3
	4	33.3	32.6	28.6	10.3	24.0	0.0	8.0	27.3	21.4	20.6	5.6	19.8
Aggressive Behavior Among Pupils	1	6.7	9.3	9.5	27.6	18.0	0.0	20.0	9.1	7.1	12.7	27.8	13.1
	2	26.7	25.6	38.1	27.6	38.0	66.7	32.0	27.3	26.2	33.3	22.2	32.2
	3	60.0	25.6	42.9	34.5	28.0	33.3	48.0	27.3	50.0	39.7	38.9	39.5
	4	6.7	34.9	4.8	6.9	16.0	0.0	0.0	27.3	16.7	12.7	11.1	13.7
Hyper-Activity	1	6.7	7.0	4.8	6.9	6.0	0.0	0.0	9.1	4.8	4.8	5.6	4.9
	2	46.7	16.3	19.0	27.6	30.0	0.0	40.0	9.1	14.3	23.8	38.9	23.4
	3	33.3	44.2	33.3	48.3	40.0	33.3	40.0	45.5	61.9	41.3	33.3	43.9
	4	6.7	25.6	42.9	13.8	22.0	66.7	20.0	9.1	16.7	30.2	22.2	25.8

COMMENTS: QUESTION 11

COMMENT	NUMBER OF TIMES COMMENT MADE
Complacency and apathy	8
Answer refers to one school only	7
Casual truancy	5
Unwillingness to do work	5
Pupils late to class leads to conflict with teacher	3
Lack of ambition, direction, etc.	3
Damage to school fabric and equipment (serious problem)	2
No serious problems in this school	2
Graffiti	2
Lack of parental support	2
Lack of teacher competence	2
Attention seeking	2
Social incompetence (of students)	2
Failure to do homework	1
I do not allow any of these activities to take place in my lessons	1
Inability to listen to others	1
Violence to teacher - extremely rare in my experience	1
Boredom	1
Loutish behavior outside lessons	1
Chewing	1
Poor home situation	1
Failure to concentrate	1
Sexual activity	1
Bitchiness among girls (woman teacher)	1
Refusal to remove coats, etc.	1
Smoking	1
Unusual hair styles	1

COMMENTS: QUESTION 11
(cont.)

COMMMENT	NUMBER OF TIMES COMMENT MADE
Argument against justified punishment	1
Vandalism - used to disrupt	1
Pupils not used to reasonable behavior due to low parental expectations and discipline	1
Future unemployment a factor in disruption	1

Table XII (a)

"Please rate the following causes of disruptive behavior in comprehensive schools".
Use: 1=An important cause, 2=A moderate cause, 3=A slight cause, 4=Not a cause.

Cause	Importance	Position (73) Head	(63) Deputy	(322) Classroom Teacher	(4) Other	Sex (174) Female	(286) Male	School Size (5) Under 500	(188) 500 - 1000	(267) Over 1000	Experience (69) 1-3 Yrs.	(114) 8-10 Yrs.	(279) Over 10 Yrs.	Community Size (105) Under 25,000	(201) 25,000-100,000	(148) Over 100,000
Peer Pressure	1	49.3	34.9	32.9	50.0	33.9	37.4	0.0	35.1	37.5	33.3	33.3	37.6	37.1	33.8	38.3
	2	27.4	38.1	30.1	25.0	35.1	28.0	20.0	28.2	32.2	30.4	32.5	30.5	23.8	33.8	30.9
	3	17.8	19.0	28.9	25.0	22.4	28.0	60.0	26.6	24.7	26.1	31.6	22.9	33.3	24.4	22.8
	4	5.5	3.2	6.8	0.0	8.0	4.5	20.0	8.5	4.1	10.1	2.6	6.5	4.8	7.5	4.7
Lack of Interest in Subject	1	28.8	33.3	30.1	100	33.8	29.7	20.0	32.4	30.8	31.9	24.6	33.3	36.2	26.9	32.9
	2	47.9	47.6	44.7	0.0	38.5	49.0	0.0	45.2	46.1	50.7	50.9	41.6	45.7	48.3	40.9
	3	23.3	15.9	23.0	0.0	25.9	19.6	40.0	21.8	21.0	17.4	21.9	22.6	18.1	22.4	22.8
	4	0.0	3.2	1.6	0.0	1.7	1.4	40.0	0.5	1.9	0.0	2.6	1.8	0.0	2.5	2.0
Inability to do Classwork	1	16.4	22.2	22.4	75.0	24.7	20.6	0.0	21.8	21.7	21.7	28.9	19.0	16.2	20.4	26.8
	2	31.5	27.0	38.2	0.0	33.3	36.0	40.0	33.5	36.7	36.2	37.7	33.7	38.1	36.3	31.5
	3	42.5	49.2	31.1	25.0	36.2	34.6	40.0	34.6	35.6	31.9	26.3	39.8	41.0	32.3	36.2
	4	9.6	1.6	7.5	0.0	5.2	8.0	20.0	10.1	4.9	10.1	6.1	6.8	4.8	10.9	3.4
Revolt Against Adult Authority	1	19.2	22.2	19.9	50.0	19.0	21.3	20.0	18.6	21.7	21.7	18.4	21.5	21.9	21.9	18.1
	2	32.9	30.2	33.5	25.0	32.8	33.2	40.0	35.6	31.1	23.2	42.1	31.5	28.6	34.3	33.6
	3	34.2	39.7	37.3	25.0	36.8	36.7	40.0	35.1	38.2	43.5	34.2	36.2	39.0	34.3	40.3
	4	13.7	7.9	8.7	0.0	10.9	8.4	0.0	10.6	8.2	11.6	5.3	10.0	10.5	9.5	6.7
General Disinterest in School	1	26.0	28.6	31.4	50.0	33.3	28.3	80.0	31.4	28.8	27.5	28.9	31.9	32.4	27.9	32.2
	2	42.5	41.3	41.9	50.0	44.3	40.9	20.0	43.6	41.2	44.9	47.4	38.7	36.2	47.3	38.9
	3	30.1	28.6	24.5	0.0	19.0	29.7	0.0	22.3	28.5	23.2	22.8	27.6	29.5	24.4	25.5
	4	1.4	1.6	1.6	0.0	2.9	0.7	0.0	2.7	0.7	4.3	0.9	1.1	1.9	0.5	2.0
Unsettled Home Environment	1	64.4	49.2	46.3	75.0	46.0	51.7	40.0	51.6	48.3	47.8	40.4	53.8	46.7	52.7	49.0
	2	23.3	36.5	32.6	25.0	29.3	33.2	20.0	28.7	34.1	30.4	41.2	28.0	35.2	29.9	30.2
	3	12.3	11.1	18.9	0.0	22.4	13.3	40.0	18.6	15.0	20.3	17.5	15.8	17.1	15.9	17.4
	4	0.0	1.6	1.2	0.0	1.7	0.7	0.0	1.1	1.1	1.4	0.9	1.1	1.0	1.5	0.7
Dislike of Teacher	1	9.6	12.7	13.0	25.0	14.4	11.5	20.0	11.7	13.1	15.9	14.0	11.5	12.4	13.9	11.4
	2	26.0	31.7	32.3	25.0	33.3	30.4	40.0	38.8	25.8	36.2	33.2	29.4	40.0	26.4	30.2
	3	53.4	41.3	42.5	0.0	40.2	45.1	20.0	39.4	46.8	34.8	45.6	44.4	40.0	44.8	45.6
	4	9.6	11.1	11.5	50.0	11.5	11.5	20.0	9.6	12.7	13.0	7.0	12.9	6.7	14.9	10.1
Use of Drugs	1	4.1	4.8	5.0	0.0	5.2	4.5	20.0	4.8	4.9	7.2	4.4	4.7	1.9	6.5	4.7
	2	4.1	3.2	4.3	0.0	7.5	7.4	0.0	4.3	3.4	4.3	2.6	4.7	1.0	4.5	6.7
	3	13.7	15.9	16.1	0.0	14.9	15.7	20.0	14.9	16.1	17.4	21.1	12.5	16.2	14.4	16.1
	4	78.1	73.0	71.4	100	70.1	74.5	60.0	72.9	73.4	66.7	69.3	76.0	80.0	72.1	68.5
Lack of Self Esteem	1	17.8	19.0	10.9	75.0	15.5	12.6	0.0	15.4	12.0	5.8	7.9	17.6	14.3	10.9	16.1
	2	31.5	31.7	26.1	25.0	29.9	26.6	60.0	28.7	26.6	30.4	28.9	26.5	27.6	29.9	25.5
	3	42.5	36.5	42.5	0.0	37.4	43.4	20.0	39.4	43.4	40.6	48.2	38.7	39.0	45.3	37.6
	4	8.2	9.5	19.9	0.0	16.1	16.4	20.0	16.0	16.9	23.2	13.2	16.1	19.0	13.9	17.4
Pupil Psycho-logical or Emotional Instability	1	34.2	28.6	28.0	50.0	31.0	28.0	40.0	28.7	29.6	30.4	23.7	31.2	29.5	30.8	26.2
	2	32.9	28.6	30.7	50.0	31.0	31.5	40.0	35.1	27.7	34.8	34.2	29.0	25.7	31.8	33.6
	3	31.5	33.3	33.5	0.0	29.3	34.6	0.0	29.8	35.6	30.4	37.7	31.2	37.1	31.3	32.2
	4	1.4	4.8	5.9	0.0	5.7	4.5	20.0	5.3	4.5	4.3	1.8	6.5	4.8	5.5	4.7

Table XII (b)

"Please rate the following causes of disruptive behavior in comprehensive schools".
Use: 1=An important cause, 2=A moderate cause, 3=A slight cause, 4=Not a cause.

Cause	Importance	Subject Area (15) Art	(43) English	(21) Foreign Language	(29) Ind. Arts Home Ec., Ect.	(50) Math	(3) Music	(25) Phy Ed.	(11) Religious Studies	(42) Science	(63) Social Studies	(18) Other	Total Tables (a) and (b)
Peer Pressure	1	20.0	32.6	28.6	34.5	32.0	0.0	48.0	18.2	26.2	36.5	38.9	35.6
	2	46.7	37.2	33.3	27.6	32.0	66.7	16.0	18.2	28.6	30.2	27.8	30.7
	3	26.7	20.9	33.3	27.6	24.0	0.0	28.0	36.4	40.5	30.2	22.2	26.0
	4	6.7	4.7	4.8	6.9	10.0	33.3	8.0	18.2	4.8	3.2	11.1	6.0
Lack of Interest in Subject	1	13.3	46.5	33.3	34.5	34.0	0.0	40.0	18.2	26.2	19.0	50.0	30.7
	2	46.7	30.2	47.6	31.0	44.0	33.3	32.0	36.4	52.4	58.7	33.3	44.8
	3	33.3	18.6	19.0	27.6	22.0	66.7	24.0	36.4	19.0	20.6	16.7	22.1
	4	6.7	0.0	0.0	6.9	0.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	2.4	1.6	0.0	1.7
Inability to do Classwork	1	26.7	34.9	19.0	22.6	20.0	0.0	16.0	27.3	31.0	14.3	16.7	21.9
	2	20.7	27.9	42.9	37.9	46.0	100	52.0	45.5	26.2	36.5	38.9	35.2
	3	46.7	30.2	28.6	34.5	22.0	0.0	32.0	9.1	33.3	33.3	44.4	35.0
	4	6.7	2.3	9.5	0.0	12.0	0.0	0.0	9.1	9.5	14.3	0.0	7.1
Revolt Against Adult Authority	1	20.0	18.6	33.3	31.0	22.0	0.0	32.0	0.0	21.4	17.5	5.6	20.8
	2	40.0	34.9	38.1	31.0	40.0	33.3	36.0	27.3	31.0	23.8	33.3	32.6
	3	40.0	32.6	19.0	24.1	34.0	66.7	32.0	45.5	40.5	47.6	44.4	36.7
	4	0.0	9.3	9.5	13.8	4.0	0.0	0.0	27.3	7.1	11.1	16.7	9.4
General Disinterest in School	1	46.7	41.9	23.8	41.4	30.0	33.3	28.0	18.2	26.2	30.2	44.4	30.5
	2	40.0	37.2	38.1	34.5	44.0	0.0	64.0	36.4	40.5	39.7	27.8	41.8
	3	13.3	16.3	38.1	24.1	22.0	66.7	8.0	27.3	31.0	30.2	22.2	25.5
	4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	9.1	2.4	0.0	5.6	1.5
Unsettled Home Environment	1	40.0	37.2	33.3	55.2	38.0	33.3	64.0	54.5	38.1	49.2	44.4	49.6
	2	46.7	39.5	47.6	20.7	34.0	0.0	28.0	18.2	38.1	31.7	27.8	31.5
	3	13.3	18.6	19.0	24.1	26.0	66.7	8.0	18.2	21.4	15.9	22.2	16.7
	4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.4	3.2	0.0	1.1
Dislike of Teacher	1	20.0	25.6	19.0	10.3	10.0	0.0	8.0	9.1	4.8	14.3	22.2	12.7
	2	20.0	25.6	28.6	55.2	32.0	0.0	32.0	18.2	23.8	36.5	38.9	31.3
	3	53.3	34.9	38.1	31.0	50.0	66.7	48.0	45.5	52.4	38.1	22.2	43.3
	4	6.7	9.3	14.3	3.4	8.0	33.3	12.0	18.2	19.0	11.1	16.7	11.4
Use of Drugs	1	13.3	2.3	4.8	10.3	6.0	0.0	8.0	0.0	2.4	4.8	5.6	4.9
	2	6.7	9.3	9.5	0.0	6.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.8	1.6	5.6	4.6
	3	13.3	16.3	14.3	20.7	18.0	33.3	32.0	18.2	7.1	15.9	0.0	15.6
	4	66.7	67.4	71.4	58.6	70.0	66.7	60.0	54.5	83.3	76.2	88.9	72.8
Lack of Self Esteem	1	13.3	18.6	14.3	17.2	4.0	0.0	12.0	9.1	7.1	1.6	33.3	13.7
	2	6.7	27.9	9.5	41.4	28.0	33.3	32.0	9.1	26.2	23.8	27.8	27.5
	3	53.3	23.3	52.4	34.5	46.0	33.3	44.0	36.4	50.0	50.8	22.2	41.0
	4	26.7	23.3	23.8	6.9	22.0	33.3	12.0	36.4	16.7	23.8	16.7	16.5
Pupil Psychological or Emotional Instability	1	13.3	30.2	23.8	41.4	26.0	33.3	36.0	27.3	21.4	22.2	38.9	29.4
	2	53.3	30.2	38.1	41.4	24.0	33.3	32.0	0.0	28.6	31.7	33.3	30.9
	3	20.0	27.9	38.1	6.9	42.0	33.3	24.0	54.5	45.2	38.1	16.7	32.6
	4	13.3	7.0	0.0	10.3	6.0	0.0	8.0	9.1	0.0	6.3	11.1	5.4

COMMENTS: QUESTION 12

COMMENT	NUMBER OF TIMES COMMENT MADE
Lack of parental concern and support	15
Lack of jobs - hence motivation	12
General attitudes of society to all forms of authority	6
Lack of relevance of many courses	4
Never met a drug case (headmasters)	3
Depressing surroundings - old buildings	3
Abusing equipment	3
Incompetence of staff	3
Refers to one school only	3
Classes too large - teachers cannot give individual attention	3
Need for attention	2
Erosion of public respect for education and teachers	2
Worry about home situation	2
Examination pressure has adverse effect	2
Television	2
Conflict between home values and school values	2
Low staff moral (sic) Bad press - low pay, poor promotion prospects	1
Need for some form of status	1
Swamped by burdonsome regulations teachers revolt or give up	1
Pupils reflect physical violence at home by using violence at school	1
Teacher personality and approach to pupils and teaching	1
Boredom	1
Staff discipline expectations too high	1
Teachers not being good-humoured and flexible	1

COMMENTS: QUESTION 12
(cont.)

COMMENT	NUMBER OF TIMES COMMENT MADE
Low staff expectation of work and behavior on part of school management (headmaster)	1
School regarded as "holiday camp"	1
Teachers inability to defuse disruptive situation early	1
Broken homes	1
Aggressive - provocative teacher behavior	1
Teachers untrained to cope with difficult and/or low ability pupils	1
Teacher bored with his/her subject	1
Absence of adequate sanctions	1
Lack of respect for each other	1
Glue sniffing	1
Links to distinct groups - "skinheads" "British movement," etc.	1
Peer image	1
Lack of sufficient effective sanctions	1
Sheer bloody-mindedness	1
Influence of the media	1
External political pressure and manipulation	1
Homework not done	1
Pupils come to class without supplies, i.e., pencils, books, etc.	1
Teacher truancy	1

Table XIII (a)

"Please rate the following factors as to their influence in controlling disruptive pupil behavior." Use: 1=Very Important, 2=Moderately Important, 3=Of slight Importance, 4=Of no Importance.

Factor	Importance	Position (73) Head	(63) Deputy	(322) Teacher	(4) Other	Sex (174) Female	(286) Male	School Size (5) Under 500	(188) 500-1000	(267) Over 1000	Experience (69) 1-3 Years	(114) 4-10 Years	(279) Over 10 Yrs.	Community Size (105) Under 25,000	(201) 25,000-100,000	(149) Over 100,000
Positive	1	97.3	88.9	89.1	75.0	87.4	92.3	80.0	89.9	91.4	87.0	90.4	91.4	88.6	91.0	89.9
Teacher	2	2.7	9.5	7.8	0.0	9.2	5.8	0.0	8.0	6.0	13.0	6.1	5.7	9.5	6.5	6.7
Personality	3	0.0	0.0	2.5	25.0	2.9	1.0	20.0	2.1	1.5	0.0	2.6	2.2	1.9	2.5	2.0
	4	0.0	1.6	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.7	0.0	0.9	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.7
Effective	1	97.3	87.3	85.7	75.0	90.8	85.7	80.0	88.8	86.9	87.0	84.2	89.2	90.5	85.6	87.9
Teaching	2	2.7	9.5	12.4	25.0	7.5	12.6	20.0	10.1	10.9	10.1	15.8	8.6	9.5	11.4	10.7
Methods	3	0.0	1.6	1.6	0.0	1.1	1.4	0.0	1.1	1.5	2.9	0.0	1.4	0.0	3.0	0.0
	4	0.0	1.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.7
Strict	1	32.9	34.9	42.9	0.0	42.5	38.5	40.0	37.8	40.8	55.1	28.9	40.5	36.2	43.3	38.9
Disciplinary	2	45.2	52.4	42.5	75.0	46.0	43.4	40.0	48.9	41.9	36.2	57.0	41.6	50.5	38.8	47.0
Measures by	3	17.7	6.3	12.1	0.0	7.5	15.0	20.0	10.1	13.5	8.7	10.5	13.6	10.5	13.9	10.7
Teacher	4	0.0	3.2	1.6	25.0	1.7	1.7	0.0	1.6	1.9	0.0	1.8	2.2	2.9	2.0	0.7
Type	1	31.5	36.5	32.3	25.0	28.2	35.3	40.0	35.6	30.3	24.6	25.4	37.3	36.2	33.3	30.2
of	2	41.1	38.1	46.3	50.0	52.3	39.9	60.0	43.1	44.9	49.3	54.4	39.4	41.0	42.3	50.3
School	3	21.9	20.6	15.8	25.0	15.5	18.5	0.0	17.0	18.4	20.3	16.7	17.2	17.1	18.4	16.1
Population	4	5.5	3.2	4.7	0.0	2.3	5.9	0.0	4.3	4.9	5.8	3.5	4.7	5.7	5.0	2.0
Pastoral	1	54.8	46.0	36.6	0.0	41.4	39.9	60.0	38.3	41.9	39.1	34.2	43.4	43.8	37.3	43.0
Care	2	39.7	38.1	40.4	75.0	40.2	40.2	20.0	39.9	40.8	47.8	43.0	36.9	40.0	41.3	37.6
Program	3	5.5	12.7	19.6	25.0	17.2	16.1	20.0	18.6	14.6	11.6	21.1	16.1	14.3	19.4	14.8
	4	0.0	1.6	2.8	0.0	0.6	3.1	0.0	3.2	1.5	1.4	1.8	2.5	1.9	1.5	3.4
Influence	1	54.8	66.7	55.3	0.0	55.7	56.6	40.0	63.3	51.7	55.1	54.4	57.3	61.9	57.7	50.3
of	2	38.4	20.6	30.1	50.0	31.6	29.7	20.0	27.1	32.2	30.4	33.3	29.0	29.5	27.4	34.9
Headmaster-	3	6.8	11.1	12.7	25.0	10.3	12.2	20.0	8.5	13.9	14.5	9.6	11.5	7.6	13.4	12.1
mistress	4	0.0	0.0	0.9	0.0	1.1	0.3	20.0	1.1	0.4	0.0	2.6	0.4	0.0	1.5	0.7
Support	1	83.6	68.3	66.5	50.0	68.4	69.6	20.0	73.9	66.7	72.5	61.4	71.0	63.8	71.1	69.8
of	2	11.0	25.4	25.2	50.0	24.7	22.4	60.0	21.3	24.3	23.2	30.7	20.8	29.5	19.4	24.2
School by	3	4.1	4.8	6.8	0.0	5.2	6.6	20.0	4.3	6.7	4.3	7.9	5.7	6.7	7.0	4.7
Parents	4	1.4	0.0	0.9	0.0	1.1	0.7	0.0	0.5	1.1	0.0	0.0	1.4	0.0	2.0	0.0
Corporal	1	5.5	4.8	17.7	50.0	12.6	15.4	20.0	11.7	15.7	18.8	16.7	12.2	14.3	14.4	14.8
Punishment	2	17.8	20.6	28.9	0.0	24.7	26.2	40.0	25.5	25.8	36.2	24.6	23.7	22.9	30.3	36.9
	3	45.2	42.9	37.3	25.0	39.7	38.8	20.0	45.7	34.8	31.9	42.1	39.8	40.0	39.3	36.9
	4	31.5	30.2	15.8	25.0	22.4	19.2	20.0	17.0	22.8	13.0	16.7	23.7	22.9	15.9	24.2
Streaming	1	9.6	7.9	19.3	0.0	20.7	13.6	40.0	16.5	15.7	18.8	12.3	17.6	15.2	21.4	10.1
of Pupils by	2	31.5	33.3	34.5	25.0	37.4	31.8	0.0	31.4	36.3	44.9	28.9	32.6	33.3	36.3	28.9
Academic	3	28.8	36.5	26.1	50.0	28.2	27.6	20.0	30.3	26.6	23.2	36.0	26.2	27.6	23.9	34.9
Ability	4	30.1	19.0	18.6	25.0	12.6	25.2	40.0	21.8	18.7	10.1	22.8	21.9	22.9	16.9	24.2
Firm	1	69.9	77.8	70.5	50.0	73.6	69.9	0.0	73.4	70.8	72.5	72.8	70.3	74.3	70.6	68.5
Support of	2	24.7	17.5	19.3	25.0	19.0	20.3	80.0	19.1	19.5	18.8	17.5	20.8	19.0	21.9	18.8
Teacher	3	1.4	4.8	5.0	25.0	3.4	5.2	20.0	3.7	5.2	5.8	6.1	3.9	3.8	3.5	7.4
by Head	4	1.4	0.0	3.4	0.0	1.7	3.1	0.0	3.2	1.9	2.9	2.6	2.5	1.0	2.5	3.4
Special	1	15.1	27.0	29.5	25.0	27.6	26.2	20.0	26.1	27.7	34.8	27.2	24.4	26.7	26.9	27.5
Classes for	2	30.1	23.8	35.1	50.0	32.2	33.2	40.0	30.9	33.7	34.8	36.0	31.2	27.6	34.8	31.5
Disruptive	3	17.8	27.0	21.1	25.0	22.4	21.0	20.0	23.4	20.2	20.3	22.8	21.5	22.9	20.9	22.1
Pupils	4	31.5	17.5	12.1	0.0	13.8	17.1	20.0	17.0	15.0	10.1	13.2	18.3	20.0	13.9	16.1

Table XIII (b)

"Please rate the following factors as to their influence in controlling disruptive pupil behavior. Use 1=very important, 2=moderately important 3=of slight importance, 4=of no importance."

Factor	Importance	Subject Area (15) Art	(43) English	(21) Foreign Language	(29) Ind. Arts Home Ec. etc.	(50) Math	(3) Music	(25) Phy. Ed.	(11) Religious Studies	(42) Science	(63) Social Studies	(18) Other	Total Tables (a) & (b)
Positive Teacher Personality	1	73.3	86.0	100	86.2	84.0	66.7	88.0	63.6	90.5	95.2	94.4	89.7
	2	13.3	7.0	0.0	13.8	10.0	33.3	8.0	18.2	7.1	4.8	5.6	7.3
	3	13.3	4.7	0.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	4.0	9.1	2.4	0.0	0.0	2.1
	4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.4
Effective Teaching Methods	1	86.7	81.4	95.2	86.2	80.0	66.7	84.0	72.7	92.9	87.3	83.3	87.6
	2	13.3	16.3	0.0	10.3	20.0	33.3	16.0	18.2	2.4	11.1	16.7	10.5
	3	0.0	0.0	4.8	3.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.8	1.6	0.0	1.3
	4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2
Strict Disciplinary Measures by Teacher	1	40.0	34.9	33.3	55.2	40.0	66.7	52.0	45.5	35.7	44.4	44.4	39.9
	2	53.3	39.5	57.1	34.5	56.0	33.3	48.0	36.4	42.9	33.3	38.9	44.4
	3	6.7	23.3	9.5	10.3	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	19.0	17.5	11.1	12.0
	4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.4	4.8	5.6	1.8
Type of School Population	1	33.3	23.3	14.3	48.3	40.0	33.3	32.0	45.5	31.0	25.4	38.9	32.8
	2	60.0	53.5	52.4	37.9	32.0	66.7	36.0	27.3	50.0	57.1	50.0	44.2
	3	6.7	16.3	19.0	10.3	22.0	0.0	24.0	9.1	14.3	14.3	5.6	17.4
	4	0.0	4.7	14.3	3.4	6.0	0.0	8.0	0.0	4.8	3.2	0.0	4.5
Pastoral Care Program	1	40.0	37.2	33.3	51.7	30.0	67.7	52.0	36.4	38.1	28.6	27.8	40.3
	2	0.0	37.2	52.4	37.9	40.0	33.3	36.0	27.3	38.1	52.4	33.3	40.1
	3	53.3	20.9	9.5	10.3	26.0	0.0	8.0	18.2	23.8	17.5	27.8	16.5
	4	6.7	2.3	4.8	0.0	2.0	0.0	4.0	9.1	0.0	1.6	11.1	2.1
Influence of Headmaster-Mistress	1	73.3	39.5	47.6	62.1	56.0	100	56.0	54.5	52.4	47.6	66.7	56.0
	2	20.0	27.9	42.9	31.0	32.0	0.0	36.0	27.3	40.5	27.0	27.8	30.3
	3	0.0	25.6	9.5	6.9	12.0	0.0	8.0	0.0	7.1	22.2	0.0	11.6
	4	6.7	2.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.2	0.0	0.9
Support of School by Parents	1	40.0	58.1	76.2	75.9	76.0	66.7	80.0	54.5	50.0	66.7	72.2	68.7
	2	40.0	32.6	14.3	24.1	22.0	0.0	16.0	18.2	38.1	23.8	16.7	23.4
	3	20.0	7.0	9.5	0.0	2.0	33.3	0.0	18.2	9.5	6.3	11.1	6.0
	4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	2.4	1.6	0.0	1.1
Corporal Punishment	1	33.3	14.0	19.0	20.7	22.0	0.0	20.0	27.3	7.1	20.6	11.1	14.6
	2	20.0	27.9	23.8	27.6	24.0	66.7	48.0	27.3	33.3	25.4	22.2	25.8
	3	40.0	27.9	42.9	41.4	44.0	0.0	20.0	36.4	40.5	31.7	61.1	38.8
	4	6.7	27.9	14.3	10.3	10.0	33.3	12.0	0.0	19.0	22.2	5.6	20.2
Streaming of Pupils by Academic Ability	1	13.3	18.6	23.8	24.1	28.0	33.3	20.0	18.7	21.4	12.7	11.1	16.3
	2	33.2	30.2	38.1	41.4	26.0	66.7	44.0	36.4	31.0	34.9	38.9	33.7
	3	40.0	23.3	19.0	17.2	28.0	0.0	20.0	18.2	28.6	30.2	33.3	27.9
	4	13.3	23.3	19.0	13.8	16.0	0.0	16.0	9.1	19.0	22.2	16.7	20.4
Firm Support of Teacher by Head	1	66.7	69.8	66.7	72.4	74.0	66.7	76.0	72.7	69.0	66.7	66.7	70.8
	2	20.0	20.9	23.8	20.7	16.0	33.3	16.0	0.0	16.7	25.4	11.1	20.0
	3	6.7	2.3	4.8	0.0	2.0	0.0	4.0	9.1	9.5	4.8	16.7	4.7
	4	6.7	4.7	4.8	0.0	8.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	3.2	5.6	2.6
Special Classes for Disruptive Pupils	1	26.7	23.3	28.6	27.6	26.0	33.3	36.0	36.4	23.8	34.9	38.9	26.8
	2	53.3	37.2	19.0	41.4	32.0	66.7	32.0	27.3	42.9	31.7	27.8	32.8
	3	13.3	18.6	14.3	24.1	32.0	0.0	28.0	18.2	16.7	19.0	11.1	22.5
	4	6.7	16.3	38.1	6.9	8.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	14.3	12.7	11.1	15.8

Table XIII (c)

"Please rate the following factors as to their influence in controlling disruptive pupil behavior. Use: 1=Very important, 2=Moderately important, 3=Of slight importance, 4=Of no importance.

Factor	Importance	Position			Sex		School Size			Experience			Community Size		
		(73) Head	(63) Deputy	(322) Teacher	(4) Other	(174) Female	(286) Male	(5) Under 500	(188) 500-1000	(267) Over 1000	(69) 1-3 years	(114) 4-10 years	(279) Over 10yrs.	(105) Under 25,000	(201) 25,000 100,000	(149) Over 100,000
Expelling or Suspending Disruptive Pupils	1	31.5	25.4	32.3	25.0	33.9	29.7	20.0	30.3	31.8	29.0	35.1	30.8	26.7	33.8	31.5
	2	41.1	57.1	36.0	50.0	33.9	43.4	60.0	42.0	38.2	42.0	35.1	41.2	45.7	36.3	40.3
	3	20.5	14.3	23.3	25.0	21.8	21.3	20.0	20.7	22.1	23.7	22.8	20.1	21.9	19.9	22.8
	4	6.8	0.0	7.1	0.0	8.0	4.9	0.0	6.9	5.6	5.8	7.0	5.7	4.8	8.5	4.0
Help from School Social Worker	1	11.0	17.5	8.7	25.0	13.2	8.7	20.0	10.6	9.7	8.7	8.8	11.8	12.4	10.0	8.7
	2	26.0	22.2	29.8	25.0	31.0	25.9	60.0	30.3	26.2	44.9	31.6	22.6	19.0	30.3	30.2
	3	38.4	42.9	37.3	50.0	37.9	38.8	20.0	36.2	40.1	34.8	36.0	39.4	52.4	34.3	34.9
	4	23.3	14.3	22.0	0.0	15.5	24.5	0.0	21.8	21.0	11.6	21.9	23.3	13.3	22.9	24.8
Reducing Academic Marks	1	2.7	0.0	2.8	0.0	1.7	2.8	0.0	1.1	3.0	0.0	2.6	2.9	1.9	1.5	4.0
	2	8.2	4.8	11.2	0.0	12.1	8.4	40.0	9.6	9.7	8.7	14.0	8.6	10.5	10.4	8.7
	3	19.2	23.8	28.3	50.0	26.4	25.5	0.0	21.8	29.6	33.3	26.3	24.0	26.7	24.9	26.8
	4	69.9	66.7	55.0	50.0	56.3	61.2	60.0	67.0	53.6	58.0	55.3	60.9	59.0	60.7	57.0
Withholding of Priveleges	1	8.2	6.3	12.4	0.0	12.1	10.1	20.0	11.7	10.1	14.5	8.8	10.8	14.3	8.0	12.1
	2	37.0	33.3	37.3	75.0	39.1	35.3	20.0	36.7	38.2	42.0	47.4	32.3	41.9	36.8	34.2
	3	41.1	47.6	34.2	0.0	35.6	37.8	40.0	37.8	36.3	34.8	30.7	39.8	37.1	37.3	36.2
	4	13.7	11.1	14.9	25.0	12.1	15.7	20.0	12.8	14.2	7.2	12.3	16.1	6.7	16.9	15.4
Parent-Teacher Conferences	1	32.0	30.2	21.4	25.0	25.3	24.8	80.0	22.9	26.2	23.2	21.1	27.6	31.4	20.4	27.5
	2	38.4	31.7	44.1	50.0	44.3	39.5	20.0	41.5	41.9	42.0	46.5	39.1	37.1	43.3	41.6
	3	17.8	30.2	27.3	25.0	26.4	26.6	0.0	31.4	22.5	31.9	26.3	24.7	25.7	27.9	24.8
	4	6.8	4.8	5.9	0.0	2.9	7.7	0.0	3.7	7.5	1.4	6.1	6.8	4.8	7.5	4.0
Appeal of Subject to Typical Pupil	1	28.8	27.0	26.7	25.0	29.3	25.9	20.0	27.1	27.7	34.8	26.3	25.8	28.6	26.4	26.2
	2	53.4	58.7	46.9	50.0	47.1	50.7	60.0	53.2	46.1	40.6	50.0	51.3	55.2	46.8	49.0
	3	12.3	6.3	18.0	25.0	17.2	14.7	0.0	14.4	16.9	20.3	17.5	13.6	13.3	15.9	17.4
	4	5.5	3.2	6.5	0.0	4.0	7.0	20.0	4.8	6.4	2.9	6.1	6.5	1.9	8.5	5.4
Age Level of Pupils	1	20.5	25.4	18.3	25.0	17.2	21.3	40.0	17.6	20.6	20.3	14.0	21.9	23.8	18.4	18.8
	2	49.3	31.7	38.2	50.0	36.2	41.3	0.0	41.5	38.2	33.3	40.4	39.8	34.3	40.8	40.3
	3	12.3	27.0	26.7	25.0	28.2	22.0	20.0	22.3	26.2	27.5	28.9	22.2	25.7	23.9	24.2
	4	16.4	11.1	14.6	0.0	15.5	13.3	40.0	17.6	11.6	17.4	14.9	13.3	14.3	14.9	14.1
Consistent Application of Behavior Standards	1	72.6	77.8	67.4	25.0	69.0	69.6	100	72.9	66.7	71.0	67.5	69.9	71.4	69.7	68.5
	2	20.5	14.3	21.4	50.0	21.3	19.9	0.0	18.1	22.5	21.7	22.8	19.0	21.9	19.4	20.1
	3	4.1	3.2	7.8	25.0	7.5	6.3	0.0	6.4	6.7	4.3	7.0	7.2	5.7	7.0	6.7
	4	2.7	4.8	2.2	0.0	1.7	3.1	0.0	2.7	2.6	1.4	2.6	2.9	1.0	3.0	3.4
Establishing Behavior Standards Early On	1	87.7	88.9	86.3	75.0	91.4	84.3	80.0	89.4	84.6	92.8	86.0	85.7	86.7	86.1	87.2
	2	9.6	7.9	10.2	0.0	5.7	12.2	0.0	8.5	10.9	5.8	10.5	10.0	11.4	10.0	8.1
	3	2.7	0.0	2.2	25.0	1.1	2.4	0.0	1.6	2.6	0.0	1.8	2.9	1.0	2.5	2.7
	4	0.0	1.6	0.3	0.0	0.6	0.3	20.0	0.0	0.7	0.0	0.9	0.7	1.0	0.5	0.7
Treating Causes of Behavior Problems	1	71.2	76.2	63.0	100	68.4	65.0	80.0	65.4	66.7	60.9	69.3	66.7	73.3	60.7	67.8
	2	26.0	15.9	25.5	0.0	23.6	24.5	20.0	23.9	24.3	33.3	21.1	22.9	19.0	27.4	24.2
	3	2.7	4.8	7.8	0.0	5.7	7.0	0.0	9.6	4.5	2.9	8.8	6.5	5.7	8.5	4.7
	4	0.0	1.6	0.9	0.0	1.1	0.7	0.0	0.5	1.1	0.0	0.9	1.1	1.0	1.0	0.7
Variety of Instructional Patterns	1	38.4	46.0	30.1	100	40.2	30.4	20.0	31.4	36.0	29.0	27.2	38.7	27.6	31.3	43.0
	2	42.5	27.0	42.2	0.0	39.1	40.2	60.0	42.0	38.2	43.5	45.6	36.2	46.7	41.8	31.5
	3	13.7	14.3	20.2	0.0	17.2	18.9	20.0	17.6	18.7	20.3	19.3	17.2	21.0	17.4	17.4
	4	1.4	6.3	4.3	0.0	2.3	5.2	0.0	5.9	3.0	2.9	6.1	3.6	2.9	4.5	4.7

Table XIII (d)

"Please rate the following factors as to their importance in controlling disruptive pupil behavior. Use: 1=Very important, 2=Moderately important, 3=Of slight importance, 4=Of no importance.

Factor	Importance	Subject Area (15) Art	(43) English	(21) Foreign Language	(29) Ind. Arts Home Ec. etc.	(50) Math	(3) Music	(25) Phy. Ed.	(11) Religious Studies	(42) Science	(63) Social Studies	(18) Other	Total Tables (c) & (d)
Expelling or Suspending Disruptive Pupils	1	60.0	27.9	23.8	37.9	38.0	66.7	24.0	27.3	26.2	31.7	38.9	31.3
	2	26.7	41.9	47.6	34.5	38.0	0.0	28.0	18.2	35.7	36.5	38.9	39.5
	3	13.3	16.3	23.8	13.8	22.0	33.3	40.0	36.4	21.4	25.4	16.7	21.7
	4	0.0	11.6	0.0	13.8	2.0	0.0	8.0	0.0	14.3	6.3	5.6	6.0
Help from School Social Worker	1	33.3	14.0	0.0	17.2	4.0	0.0	8.0	18.2	7.1	6.3	11.1	10.5
	2	26.7	25.6	52.4	31.0	26.0	33.3	40.0	18.2	23.8	27.0	22.2	28.6
	3	13.3	37.2	38.1	27.6	46.0	33.3	28.0	36.4	40.5	39.7	50.0	38.0
	4	26.7	20.9	9.5	20.7	24.0	33.3	24.0	9.1	21.4	25.4	16.7	22.0
Reducing Academic Marks	1	6.7	0.0	4.8	6.9	2.0	0.0	4.0	9.1	0.0	3.2	5.6	2.4
	2	20.0	11.6	23.8	6.9	8.0	33.3	16.0	0.0	9.5	12.7	5.6	9.9
	3	26.7	30.7	33.3	41.4	16.0	0.0	48.0	27.3	26.2	23.8	16.7	26.4
	4	46.7	46.5	38.1	44.8	72.0	66.7	32.0	45.5	61.9	58.7	72.2	58.6
Withholding of Priveleges	1	13.3	14.0	4.8	17.2	6.0	66.7	12.0	18.2	11.9	15.9	5.6	10.7
	2	26.7	39.5	57.1	37.9	34.0	0.0	44.0	27.3	31.0	38.1	44.4	37.3
	3	26.7	32.6	28.6	41.4	42.0	33.3	32.0	18.2	38.1	33.3	22.2	36.5
	4	33.3	9.3	9.5	3.4	18.0	0.0	12.0	9.1	19.0	12.7	27.8	14.2
Parent-Teacher Conferences	1	13.3	32.6	14.3	27.6	14.0	66.7	44.0	9.1	21.4	15.9	16.7	25.3
	2	46.7	34.9	42.9	44.8	46.0	33.0	32.0	54.5	38.1	54.0	50.0	41.2
	3	26.7	23.3	38.1	27.6	32.0	0.0	20.0	9.1	31.0	25.4	27.8	26.2
	4	13.3	4.7	4.8	0.0	8.0	0.0	4.0	9.1	9.5	4.8	5.6	5.8
Appeal of Subject to Typical Pupil	1	33.3	27.9	14.3	48.3	20.0	33.3	28.0	18.2	28.6	23.8	44.4	27.0
	2	46.7	44.2	76.2	41.4	46.0	66.7	52.0	63.6	33.3	44.4	33.3	49.4
	3	20.0	18.6	4.8	3.4	24.0	0.0	12.0	9.1	21.4	25.4	16.7	15.8
	4	0.0	7.0	4.8	3.4	8.0	0.0	8.0	0.0	14.3	6.3	0.0	5.8
Age Level of Pupils	1	20.0	18.6	14.3	31.0	14.0	33.3	28.0	9.1	16.7	15.9	16.7	19.5
	2	26.7	34.9	38.1	34.5	46.0	33.3	32.0	45.5	38.1	39.7	50.0	39.8
	3	46.7	27.9	28.6	20.7	26.0	33.3	24.0	27.3	26.2	27.0	16.7	24.5
	4	6.7	14.0	14.3	10.3	10.0	0.0	16.0	9.1	19.0	17.5	16.7	14.2
Consistent Application of Behavior Standards	1	46.7	65.1	61.9	65.5	64.0	100	76.0	63.6	73.8	69.8	55.6	69.3
	2	33.3	23.3	14.3	20.7	26.0	0.0	20.0	18.2	19.0	20.6	27.8	20.4
	3	20.0	4.7	9.5	10.3	8.0	0.0	4.0	9.1	7.1	6.3	16.7	6.7
	4	0.0	2.3	9.5	3.4	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.2	0.0	2.6
Establishing Behavior Standards Early On	1	66.7	90.7	85.7	89.7	84.0	100	92.0	72.7	85.7	87.3	83.3	86.3
	2	26.7	4.7	14.3	10.3	8.0	0.0	8.0	18.2	7.1	12.7	11.1	9.9
	3	0.0	2.3	0.0	0.0	6.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.8	0.0	5.6	2.1
	4	6.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.4	0.0	0.0	0.6
Treating Causes of Behavior Problems	1	60.0	58.1	61.9	62.1	62.0	33.3	60.0	63.6	52.4	73.0	77.8	66.6
	2	20.0	25.6	28.6	31.0	24.0	66.7	32.0	27.3	31.0	17.5	22.2	24.2
	3	13.3	7.0	4.8	6.9	12.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	9.5	9.5	0.0	6.4
	4	6.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	2.4	0.0	0.0	0.9
Variety of Instructional Problems	1	33.3	32.6	42.9	34.5	20.0	33.3	24.0	27.3	21.4	39.7	50.0	34.3
	2	40.0	39.5	28.6	51.7	48.0	66.3	40.0	45.5	40.5	36.5	33.3	39.5
	3	26.7	16.3	23.8	10.3	20.0	0.0	36.0	9.1	26.2	17.5	16.7	18.0
	4	0.0	4.7	4.8	3.4	8.0	0.0	0.0	9.1	4.8	4.8	0.0	6.3

COMMENTS: QUESTION 13

COMMENT	NUMBER OF TIMES COMMENT MADE
Establishing good teacher-pupil relationship throughout school	4
Creation of a caring atmosphere	4
Reduced class size	3
Organizing school to meet variety of needs instead of organizing students to meet variety of courses	3
More welfare and psychological support	3
Attractive surroundings	3
Positive reinforcement for good behavior	3
Lowered pupil-teacher ratio	3
Availability of reserves	3
Regime based on respect rather than fear	2
Visible dedication of teaching force	2
Compassionate listening to children's complaints	2
Pupils must be quite clear as to what is expected of them as regards behavior	2
Consistency	2
Courses appropriate to interest and aptitude of lower ability pupils	2
Temporary "sin bins" - must not become "sinks" for problems of weak teachers	2
Expect high standards (of work) from pupils	2
Interested staff	2
Staff truancy	2
Teachers who can teach	2
Explain (disciplinary) policy and curriculum to pupils	1
Good all-around school tone	1
Influence of peers	1
Wide opportunities for extra-curricular activities	1
Places in which to isolate disruptive students	1

COMMENTS: QUESTION 13
(cont.)

COMMENT	NUMBER OF TIMES COMMENT MADE
Experience, maturity and confidence of teachers	1
Genuine interest in the care and development of children by all staff/teachers	1
Setting of example from head thru staff	1
Morale of staff which directly affects pupil behavior	1
Knowledge of individual people	1
More contact with parents before any serious problems develop	1
Give pupils some say in how school is run	1
(Make) lessons optional	1
Power of staff to enforce own discipline	1
Fairness	1
Friendly but firm attitude by the teacher (not over familiarity)	1
Many teachers need a firm hand, too	1
Continuity of teaching staff	1
Support of one teacher for another	1
Talking through problems by staff and pupils	1
Self-examination by teaching staff of methods	1
Pupils fear of bad references (from school)	1
Firm action by courts, etc., towards law breakers	1
Good staff communications	1
The threat of corporal punishment	1
Counseling is very important	1
Curriculum - what is taught and how	1
Individual attention and encouragement outside the lesson	1
Stable relationships between pupils and staff throughout school life	1
Separation of age groups	1
Allow all pupils to find success within the school system	1

Table XIV (a)

"Considering the factors listed in Q. 13, please rank the five you consider to be most essential in maintaining acceptable classroom order in thier range of importance."

	Position				Sex		School Size			Experience			Community Size		
	73		322	4	174	286	5	188	267	69	114	279	105	201	149
	Head	Deputy	Teacher	Other	Female	Male	Under 500	500-1000	Over 1000	1-3 Years	4-10 Years	Over 10 Yrs.	Under 25,000	25,000-100,000	Over 100,000
Positive Teacher Personality	1st	1st	1st	1st	1st	1st	1st	1st	1st	1st	1st	1st	1st	1st	1st
Effective Teaching Methods	2nd	2nd	2nd	2nd	2nd	2nd	2nd	2nd	2nd	2nd	2nd	2nd	2nd	2nd	2nd
Strict Disciplinary Measures by Teacher															
Type of School Population															
Pastoral Care Program		4th					4th								
Influence of Head, etc.		5th										5th			
Support of School by Parents	3rd					4th		5th	5th		4th	4th		4th	4th
Corporal Punishment															
Streaming of Pupils by Academic Ability															
Firm Support of Teacher by Head			4th		4th				4th	4th			5th	5th	
Special Classes for Disruptive Pupils															
Expel or Suspend Disruptive Pupils															
Help from School Social Worker															
Reducing Academic Marks															
Withholding of Privileges															
Parent-Teacher Conferences															
Appeal of Subject to Typical Pupil															
Age Level of Pupils															
Consistent Application of Behavior Standards	4th		5th	5th	5th	5th	2nd	4th		5th	5th		4th		5th
Establishing Behavior Standards Early On	5th	3rd	3rd	4th	3rd	3rd	3rd	3rd	3rd	3rd	3rd	3rd	3rd	3rd	3rd
Treating Causes of Behavior Problems				3rd											
Variety of Instructional Patterns															

Table XIV (b)

"Considering the factors listed in Q. 13, please rank the five you consider to be most essential in maintaining acceptable classroom order in their range of importance."

	Subject Area											
	15 Art	43 English	21 Foreign Language	29 Indus. Art Home Ec.	50 Math	3 Music	25 Phy. Educ.	11 Religious Studies	42 Science	63 Social Studies	18 Other	Total a&b
Positive Teacher Personality	1st	1st	1st	1st	1st	5th	1st	1st	1st	1st	1st	1st
Effective Teaching Methods	2nd	2nd	3rd	2nd	2nd	1st	2nd	5th	2nd	2nd	2nd	2nd
Strict Disciplinary Measures by Teacher							5th	3rd		5th	4th	
Type of School Population												
Pastoral Care Program												
Influence of Head, etc.	4th	5th										
Support of School by Parents				4th		4th		2nd			5th	
Corporal Punishment												
Streaming of Pupils by Academic Ability												
Firm Support of Teacher by Head	3rd		4th	5th	5th	2nd	4th	4th	4th			4th
Special Classes for Disruptive Pupils												
Expel or Suspend Disruptive Pupils												
Help from School Social Worker												
Reducing Academic Marks												
Withholding of Privileges												
Parent-Teacher Conferences												
Appeal of Subject to Typical Pupil	5th											
Age Level of Pupils												
Consistent Application of Behavior Standards		4th	5th		4th				5th	4th		5th
Establishing Behavior Standards Early On		3rd	2nd	3rd	3rd	3rd	3rd	3rd	3rd	3rd	3rd	3rd
Treating Causes of Behavior Problems												
Variety of Instructional Patterns												

Table XV

Suggestions to reduce the problem of classroom disruption.
Listed in order of popularity.

Suggestion	Number of Times Suggestion Made
Reasonable numbers in classes (smaller groups)	71
High standard of behavior, work and discipline expected by staff and 100% effort toward this end	31
Insure that examination dominated curriculum is relevant to all pupils	30
Raise entry standards for teaching	30
Better teacher training	26
More human, mature relationships among staff and pupils	25
Force parents to be more responsible for their childrens' behavior - withdraw (welfare) benefits, etc.	20
Replace ineffective teachers	18
Well-planned, interesting lessons	14
More relevant, interesting activity based classwork	14
Lower school leaving age	13
Strong support and leadership from headmaster	12
More adequate teaching resources	12
A consistent, stable and committed teacher who admits to mistakes but will work on his own and his pupils weaknesses	12
Closer liaison with parents	11
In-Service teacher training (on handling disruption problems)	11
Consistent, fair and just standards of behavior and punishments	10

Suggestion	Number of Times Suggestion Made
Improve standards of adult society	8
Systematic approach to rules of behavior - understood and accepted by majority of staff, pupils and parents	8
"Sin Bin" System	7
Encourage parental and involvement support	7
Know your children	7
Help for probationary teacher by a senior member of staff	7
Alternative aims and subjects for non-academic students	6
More cooperative action among head and staff on dealing with problem pupils	6
Provide adequate facilities and pleasant school environment	6
Teachers who are firm, fair and friendly	6
An experienced, mature, confident teacher	6
Rigorous probationary period for new teachers	5
Increase opportunities to succeed - cease to view education as a race where most pupils fall at the first hurdle	5
Ample time for staff relaxation and course preparation	5
Appropriate pastoral system to support an effective curriculum	5
Pay better salaries to attract better quality persons into teaching	5
Strict discipline in infant and junior schools	5
More time to talk and relate to pupils on a personal basis	4
Social pressures on press and populace to improve public image of schools	4

Suggestion	Number of Times Suggestion Made
Re-establish order and law and moral standards and patriotism in our land	4
Improved job prospects for all school-leavers	4
Refresher course for parents on how to discipline their offspring	4
More welfare and psychological support	4
Expulsion of disruptive students after warnings and consultation with all involved parties	4
Teacher interest in development of individual pupil	3
Set and maintain (behavior) standards early	3
Real support by L.E.A. (Headmaster)	3
Corporal punishment	3
Give option of apprenticeship training, etc. for last year of compulsory schooling	3
More caring parents	3
Be fair but be the boss!	3
Teacher on time for class	3
Single site schools	3
Stability of staff	2
"On report" system	2
Special units for senior disruptive pupils	2
More flexible curriculum choices for pupils	2
Effective training of staff in problems of contemporary schools	2

Suggestion	Number of Times Suggestion Made
Split up disruptive elements (Do not put them together)	2
More balanced catchment areas	2
Keep pupils occupied and involved (with worthwhile work)	2
Get teachers to realize that firm disciplinary measure do not spoil one's chances of establishing a good personal relationship with pupils	2
More time for pastoral staff to do its work	2
Firm but flexible discipline	2
Compulsory attendance of parents for at least an annual consultation	2
Closer supervision of suspended students (not a holiday)	2
Easier suspension of very disruptive pupils	2
A pastoral system which works effectively for all pupils	2
Experienced teachers should take problem children	2
Have adults sit in on classes - parents take part in lessons	2
Have effective "staff presence" around school during lunch & breaks	1
Reduce time-consuming bureaucracy	1
Resumption of capital punishment	1
No interuptions when lesson is in progress	1
More resources available to the Head	1
More stable teaching situations for disruptive pupils, same place, same teacher, etc.	1
Schools must substitute for common problem of lack of effectual father, by being firm, fair but kind.	1

Suggestion	Number of Times Suggestion Made
BRING BACK THE BIRCH	1
Less publicity in media given to bad behavior	1
Good organization within school	1
Be kind to children from birth - more tolerance - less authority	1
Be realistic in what you expect from pupils	1
Give inducements for experienced teachers to remain in classroom instead of seeking promotion to administration	1
Sort out society	1
Eliminate aggressive, dictatorial teachers who make unreasonable demands	1
Each teacher fill in a report of every class - to identify when and where and who caused any disruption	1
More perceptive presentation of authority attitudes by teachers	1
Caning of offenders in front of the rest of the school	1
Create loyalty to school	1
"Put me in charge!!"	1
Closer liaison between all social welfare workers and teaching staff	1
(Select) "more extraverts with a streak of genial brutality"	1
Group according to ability	1
Establish respect between staff and pupils - hard work required by head (Head)	1
Alternatives for anti-"school" population	1
Have mixed ability classes wherever possible	1

Suggestion	Number of Times Suggestion Made
More residential places available for those with severe behavioral problems	1
More suitable exam syllabi for older pupils	1
Provide chances for teachers to get to know pupils outside the teaching environment	1
Return to "old fashioned" standards of behavior	1
Re-acknowledgement that school is a place of work	1
Education for future parenthood - for welfare of future generations	1
Better understanding by teachers of pupils' communication skills	1
Deal much more severly with the minority who are the root cause of the problem. Don't simply wait for them to leave school.	1
Short and sharp disciplinary measures - on the spot	1
Extra-curricular activities important	1
Gain interest of pupils at the very start of the lesson	1
Non-compulsory schooling (schools are "sin bins" for controlling many pupils for society)	1
Concentrate (disciplinary) efforts into yearly, i.e., prevention rather than cure	1
Actual disruption is at the "Chalk Front" and will be minimized by good teachers supported by an effective pastoral system	1
Teachers should have work experience other than teaching	1
Teach self-discipline	1
Create courses appropriate to present society and technology	1
A firm discipline by the teacher which must be held until the group is well-controlled and self disciplined	1

Suggestion	Number of Times Suggestion Made
Meaningful sanctions	1
Program to convince parents and pupils that your school provides the best possible education for the society in which they live	1
Good staff morale	1
Team teaching	1
Less political interference so that schools are not constantly reorganizing	1
Teach pupils study skills from 1st form - leads to increased confidence which can reduce attacks on the system because of pupil insecurity	1
Appointment of firm, no-nonsense heads and senior staff	1

MACALESTER COLLEGE
Education Department
Saint Paul, Minnesota 55105
(612) 647-6302

I am seeking your help in a study of classroom discipline in English comprehensive secondary schools. As a part of this research a survey sample of 10% of all English comprehensive schools is being made. Your school has been chosen through the use of a completely random selection procedure.

If you are able to assist several questionnaires will be sent to you on the problems, factors and procedures involved in dealing with classroom disruption. The forms will not be long - one page on both sides. They would be mailed to you in early March 1981. I hope you will be willing to do two things:

1. Complete a questionnaire yourself or give it to another school administrator to fill in.

2. Distribute the other questionnaires to some (4-6) teachers of your school on a random basis, i.e. some starting teachers, some experienced, male, female, and a variety of subject matter areas.

Stamped and addressed envelopes will be enclosed to facilitate a convenient return.

This study is being made in the hope of identifying some reactions to and methods of coping with the matter of disruptive classroom behavior. American teachers seem to be plagued with this problem to an increasing extent. We are looking for help!

This research is being supported by money from the Mellon Fund and is part of a Sabbatical leave study of the issue. I will be in England during March, April and May 1981. In the past I have made several studies of English schools and have been graciously helped by many English teachers and heads. I am hoping for a similar kindly response to this request.

Permission to contact you has been given by the Chief Education Officer of your area.

Knowing of the many calls on your time any help you can give with this survey is most gratefully appreciated. Thank you.

Very truly yours,

RBDierenfield

Richard B. Dierenfield, Ed.D.
Professor and Chairman
Department of Education

RBD:ps

QUESTIONNAIRE ON CLASSROOM DISCIPLINE IN ENGLISH COMPREHENSIVE SECONDARY SCHOOLS

Disruptive behavior is an increasing problem in American public secondary schools. This survey seeks to identify some problems, factors and solutions of disruptive pupil behavior in English comprehensive secondary schools. It is hoped that some insights gained as a result of this investigation may provide help in dealing with the matter in our schools. No individual or school will be named in any report of this study. Please use the stamped, addressed envelope to return this form. Your willingness to complete this questionnaire is greatly appreciated. Thank you.

Please put the letter of your answer in the space provided.

1. In which country, borough or other education authority is your school located?

_____ 2. In what type of school are you employed?

A. Mixed school
B. Boys school
C. Girls school

_____ 3. What is your position in the school?

A. Headmaster, headmistress or principal
B. Deputy head
C. Classroom teacher
D. Other _____

_____ 4. For purposes of analysis of a very important variable would you please indicate your sex?

A. Female
B. Male

_____ 5. (For classroom teachers only) In what general subject matter area is your primary teaching responsibility?

A. Art
B. English language and literature
C. Foreign language
D. Industrial arts, home economics or secretarial studies
E. Mathematics
F. Music
G. Physical education
H. Religious studies
I. Science
J. Social science
K. Other _____

_____ 6. What is the enrollment of your school?

A. Under 500 pupils
B. 500-1000 pupils
C. Over 1000 pupils

_____ 7. How long have you been employed in secondary schools?

A. 1-3 years
B. 4-10 years
C. Over 10 years

_____ 8. In what sized community is your school located?

A. Under 25,000 population
B. 25,000 - 100,000 population
C. Over 100,000 population

_____ 9. How would you assess the extent of classroom disruption in comprehensive schools?

A. Not really a problem
B. Only a mild difficulty
C. A problem but one with which it is possible to cope
D. A severe situation
E. Totally out of control
Comment (if any) _____

_____ 10. In what direction do you believe classroom disruption has been moving during your experience in comprehensive schools?

A. Becoming *less* severe
B. Remaining about the same
C. Becoming *more* severe
Comment (if any): _____

(Please turn over)

11. Please rate the following types of troublesome pupil behavior in comprehensive schools according to their effect on reasonable order.

Use: 1 = A serious problem
2 = A moderate problem
3 = A slight problem
4 = No problem at all

_____ A. Inappropriate talking
_____ B. Other inattention
_____ C. Impertinence
_____ D. Abusive talk to teacher
_____ E. Physical violence to other pupils
_____ F. Physical violence to teacher
_____ G. Making inappropriate noises
_____ H. Aggressive behavior among pupils
_____ I. Hyper-activity
J. Other _____

12. Please rate the following *causes* of disruptive behavior in comprehensive schools.

Use: 1 = An important cause
2 = A moderate cause
3 = A slight cause
4 = Not a cause

_____ A. Peer pressure
_____ B. Lack of interest in subject
_____ C. Inability to do classwork
_____ D. Revolt against adult authority
_____ E. General disinterest in school
_____ F. Unsettled home environment
_____ G. Dislike of teacher
_____ H. Use of drugs
_____ I. Lack of self esteem
_____ J. Pupil psychological or emotional instability
K. Other _____
_____

13. Please rate the following *factors* as to their influence in controlling disruptive pupil behavior

Use: 1 = Very important
2 = Moderately important
3 = Of slight importance
4 = Of no importance

_____ A. Positive teacher personality
_____ B. Effective teaching methods
_____ C. Strict disciplinary measures by teacher
_____ D. Type of school population
_____ E. Pastoral care program
_____ F. Influence of headmaster/mistress or principal
_____ G. Support of school by parents
_____ H. Corporal punishment
_____ I. Streaming of pupils by academic ability
_____ J. Firm support of teacher discipline measures by head of school.
_____ K. Special classes for unusually disruptive pupils
_____ L. Expelling or suspending disruptive pupils from school
_____ M. Help from the school social worker
_____ N. Reducing academic marks
_____ O. Witholding of privileges
_____ P. Parent-teacher conferences
_____ Q. Appeal of subject to typical pupil (*i.e.* is class required or elective, abstract or of immediate value, etc.)
_____ R. Age level of pupils
_____ S. Consistent application of behavior standards to all pupils
_____ T. Establishing and maintaining classroom behavior standards early on
_____ U. Treating causes of behavior problems in addition to dealing with their symptoms
_____ V. Availability of a variety of instructional patterns within the school or system
W. Others _____
_____

14. Considering the factors listed in Question 13, please rank the *five* you consider to be most essential in maintaining acceptable classroom order in their range of importance.

_____ A. 1st
_____ B. 2nd
_____ C. 3rd
_____ D. 4th
_____ E. 5th

15. What suggestions would you offer to reduce the problem of classroom disruption?

_____
_____
_____

Thank you *very much* for taking time to complete this form.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS

Bird, C., Chessurn, R., Furlong, J., Johnson, D., Disaffected Pupils, London Educational Studies Unit, Dept. of Government, Brunel University, 1981, 134 pgs.

Caspari, I.E., Troublesome Children in Class, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1976, 144 pgs.

Clergh, M.F., Discipline and Morale In School and College, Tavistock Publications, 1971, 173 pgs.

Close, D., School Discipline, Cambridge, England, Cambridge Aids to Learning, Ltd., 1979, 48 pgs.

Comber, L.D., Whitfield, R.C., Action on Indiscipline: A Practical Guide For Teachers, Birmingham, National Association of School Masters and the Association of Women Teachers, 1979, 73 pgs.

Devon Education Department, Disruptive and Violent Behavior in Schools, Exeter, Devon County Council County Hall, 1975, 63 pgs.

Francis, P., Beyond Control? A Study of Discipline In the Comprehensive School, London, George Allen & Unwin, 1975, 184 pgs.

Galloway, D., Case Studies in Classroom Management, London, Longman, 1976, 127 pg.

Hampshire Education Authority, Help for Difficult Pupils, Hampshire County Council, 1979, 41 pgs.

Hargreaves, D.H., Hester, K., Mellor, F.J., Deviance In Classrooms, Longon, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1975, 282 pgs.

Haigh, G., On Our Side: Order, Authority and Interaction In School, London, Maurice Temple Smith, Ltd., 1979, 170 pgs.

Jennings, A., Discipline In Primary and Secondary Schools Today, London, Ward Lock Educational, 1979, 122 pgs.

Jones-Davies, C., Cave, R.G., The Disruptive Pupil in the Secondary School, London, Ward Lock Educational, 1976, 122 pgs.

Leach, D., Roybould, E.C., Learning and Behavior Difficulties in School, London, Open Books, 1977, 168 pgs.

Marsh, P., Rosser, E., Harre, R., The Rules of Disorder, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1978, 140 pgs.

National Association of Schoolmasters, Discipline In Schools, Swan Court, Hemel Hampstead, Herts, No date, no publisher given, 17 pgs.

Newell, P., A Last Resort? Corporal Punishment In Schools, Penguin Books, Ltd., 1972, 198 pgs.

Poteet, J.A., Behavior Modification: A Practical Guide for Teachers, London, University of London Press, 1973, 104 pgs.

Ridgeway, R., Aggression In Youth, London, Priory Press Ltd., 1973, 160 pgs.

Turner, B., Discipline In Schools, London, Ward Lock Educational, 1973, 122 pgs.

Wilby, P., Corporal Punishment, London, Expression Printers Ltd., 1979, 20 pgs.

PERIODICALS

"Can the Cane Isolate Us In Europe?", Education, Nov. 1979, p. 492

de la Cour, M., "Survey of LEA Regulatories on Corporal Punishment", Where, May 1977, p. 127

"Dealing With Behavior Difficulties in the Comprehensive System", Comprehensive Education, Winter 1979, p. 8

"Discipline in Comprehensives", Comprehensive Education, Summer 1975

Furlong, J., Bird, C., "How Can We Cope With Karen?", New Society, April 12, 1981, pp. 12-14

Giles, A., "Organization and Discipline In the Comprehensive School", Educational Review, June 1977, P. 213

Pritchard, D.J., "Corporal Punishment In Secondary Schools", Head Teachers Review, Nov. 1976 p. 55

Stevens, A., "The Rod and the Staff", Observer, Jan. 27, 1980, p. 45

"Suspensions and the Sin Bin Boom", Where, Nov.-Dec. 1979, pp. 307-309

"The Relative Effectiveness of Various Incentives and Deterrents", Educational Studies, Oct. 1978, p. 224

Vaughn, M., "Abolition of the Cane: The State of Play", Where, Jan. 1978, pp. 7-8

"Who Can Beat Who: With What, When and Where?", Where, June 1978

INTERVIEWS

Her Majesty's Inspectors - London
Headmasters and Headmistresses
Deputy Heads
Secondary School Teachers
Director of Research
University Professors
Chief Education Officers

So sensitive is this issue that many who spoke to me about it asked not to be identified in any written report of the study. I am respecting their wishes and my promise as well.

All I will say is that I received the opinions and ideas of the above types of school personnel from the South Coast, thru the Midlands to the North of England. I appreciate their kindness and their candor in response to my inquiries.